REPORT RESUMES

ED 019 096 LI 000 412

LIBRARY SCIENCE EDUCATION AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO COMPETENCE IN ADULT BOOK SELECTION IN PUBLIC LIBRARIES. RESEARCH SERIES NO. 9.

BY- MCCROSSAN, JOHN A.
ILLINOIS UNIV., URBANA, LIBRARY RESEARCH CENTER
ILLINOIS STATE LIBRARY, SPRINGFIELD
PUB DATE JAN 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.44 109P.

DESCRIPTORS- *LIBRARY EDUCATION, *LIBRARY MATERIAL SELECTION, *PUBLIC LIBRARIES, *EVALUATION, *LIBRARIANS, LIBRARY COLLECTIONS, PERFORMANCE FACTORS, ABILITY, LIBRARY SCHOOLS, PROFESSIONAL TRAINING,

THIS STUDY WAS DESIGNED TO TEST HYPOTHESES THAT LIBRARY SCHOOL GRADUATES AS BOOK SELECTORS FOR PUBLIC LIBRARY COLLECTIONS ARE SUPERIOR TO UNTRAINED LIBRARIANS. A STUDY WAS MADE OF LIBRARY STANDARDS AND LIBRARY LITERATURE IN ORDER TO ESTABLISH GENERALLY ACCEPTED PRINCIPLES WHICH RESULT IN BUILDING GOOD LIBRARY COLLECTIONS. TWO GROUPS OF TEN LIBRARIANS EACH WERE STUDIED, ONE COMPOSED OF LIBRARY SCHOOL GRADUATES AND THE OTHER UNTRAINED LIBRARIANS. ALL WERE EMPLOYED IN SMALL PUBLIC LIBRARIES AND SELECTED ALL THE BOOKS ADDED TO THE ADULT COLLECTIONS. THE LIBRARIES WERE VISITED, THE LIBRARIANS INTERVIEWED, AND A 5 PER CENT SAMPLE OF 1965 ADULT BOOK PURCHASES WAS DRAWN. IT WAS DISCOVERED THAT LIBRARY SCHOOL GRADUATES--(1) USED A SIGNIFICANTLY GREATER NUMBER OF BOOK SELECTION AIDS, (2) SELECTED BOOKS OF HIGHER QUALITY, (3) ACQUIRED FEWER GENERAL BOOKS FROM SALESMEN, BOOK CLUBS, OR COMMERCIAL LENDING AGENCIES, AND (4) DID SOMEWHAT BETTER IN MAKING WELL-ROUNDED SELECTIONS IN VARIOUS SUBJECT AREAS. LITTLE DIFFERENCE WAS FOUND BETWEEN THE TWO GROUPS IN THE AREA OF CONTROVERSIAL BOOKS. OTHER TESTS SHOWED THAT YEARS OF LIBRARY EXPERIENCE WERE RELATED LESS STRONGLY TO SUCCESS THAN LIBRARY SCHOOL EDUCATION AND THAT GRADUATES OF TYPE I LIBRARY SCHOOLS USUALLY PERFORMED CONSIDERABLY BETTER THAN OTHER GRADUATES. THE FACT THAT LIBRARY SCHOOL GRADUATES DID SOMEWHAT BETTER THAN THE UNTRAINED LIBRARIANS ON MOST OF THE MEASUREMENTS USED SUPPORTS THE THEORY THAT THERE ARE REAL, BUT NOT LARGE, DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LIBRARY SCHOOL GRADUATES AND UNTRAINED LIBRARIANS IN BOOK SELECTION COMPETENCE. THIS REPORT IS AN ABRIDGEMENT OF A UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS PH.D. DISSERTATION WITH THE SAME TITLE, AVAILABLE FROM UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS, BOX 1346, ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48106, ORDER NUMBER 67-6675, $3.60 FOR MICROFILM, $12.60 FOR XEROGRAPHY, 279 PAGES. (JB)

LI 000412

ED019096

Library Science Education
And
Its Relationship To Competence
In
Adult Book Selection
In
Public Libraries

John A. McCrossan

Research Associate
Library Research Center
University of Illinois

Illinois State Library

PAUL POWELL
Secretary of State and State Librarian

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Research Series No. 9

LIBRARY SCIENCE EDUCATION AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO COMPETENCE IN ADULT BOOK SELECTION IN PUBLIC LIBRARIES

JOHN A. McCROSSAN

Research Associate, Library Research Center
University of Illinois

This report is an abridgement of a Ph.D. dissertation with the same title submitted to the Graduate College, University of Illinois, 1966.

Paul Powell
Secretary of State
and State Librarian

Illinois State Library
Springfield, Illinois
January, 1967

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is an abridgement of a Ph.D. dissertation completed at the University of Illinois. The full text of the dissertation, which includes much additional material on methodology and on book selection practices, is available from University Microfilms.

Work on this study was done at the Library Research Center, Graduate School of Library Science and was supported by funds from the Illinois State Library. The author wishes to thank Dr. Guy Garrison, Director, and other staff members of the Center for helpful suggestions, criticism, and assistance.

The cooperation of the librarians who were interviewed during this research project made this report possible. The interviewees were very hospitable to the investigator, and he would like to thank them sincerely for giving so freely of their time in the interests of research.

The author wishes especially to thank those faculty members at the University of Illinois who served as the doctoral committee. Dr. Harold Goldstein, as adviser, worked closely with him on all phases of the dissertation, from research proposal to final draft. Dr. Herbert Goldhor read the manuscript at several stages and offered many perceptive suggestions. Dr. Frances B. Jenkins, Dr. Rolland Stevens and Dr. Charles Garverick also read and critized drafts of the manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES v

Chapter

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 1

Previous Research on the Relationship Between Education and Job Performance

II. OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY OF THIS STUDY 11

Cause of the Differences Between the Two Groups
Assumptions and Principles
Librarians Selected for Study
Methods of Investigation
Visits to Libraries

III. USE OF SELECTION AIDS BY GROUP A AND GROUP B LIBRARIANS 29

Number of Selection Aids Used
Relationship Between Number of Aids Used and Years of Library Experience
Cause of the Difference Between the Two Groups of Librarians
Types of Selection Aids Used
Purchasing Books Directly from Salesmen
Book Clubs and Rental Collections
Summary

IV. QUALITY OF GROUP A AND GROUP B BOOKS AS MEASURED BY BOOK REVIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 47

Test of Causal Element
Summary

V. SUBJECTS AND PUBLISHERS OF GROUP A AND GROUP B BOOKS 57

Publishers of Group A and Group B Books
Summary

TABLE OF CONTENTS (contd.)

Chapter Page

VI. CONTROVERSIAL BOOKS SELECTED BY GROUP A AND GROUP B LIBRARIANS 71

Interviews
List of Controversial Books
Approval-Disapproval of the Controversial Books
Behavior Regarding Controversial Books
Educational Level of Community
Summary

VII. CONCLUSIONS 89

Validity of the Findings
Implications for Library Schools
Suggestions for Further Research

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

1. EXPENDITURES OF LIBRARIES--1964 21
2. COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS 22
3. NUMBER OF REVIEWS IN VARIOUS MEDIA 30
4. CHI-SQUARE COMPUTATIONS 33
5. NUMBER OF LIBRARIANS IN GROUP A AND GROUP B WHO REPORTED USE OF EACH OF 42 BOOK SELECTION AIDS. 33
6. NUMBER OF GROUP A AND GROUP B LIBRARIANS WHO REPORTED USE OF LIBRARY-DIRECTED AIDS 38
7. NUMBER OF GROUP A AND GROUP B LIBRARIANS WHO REPORTED USE OF NON-LIBRARY-DIRECTED AIDS . . . 39
8. TWO SELECTION AIDS MENTIONED AS MOST HELPFUL BY EACH LIBRARIAN 40
9. NUMBER OF GROUP A AND GROUP B LIBRARIES WHICH HAD SUBSCRIPTIONS TO VARIOUS BOOK CLUBS 44
10. NUMBER AND PERCENT OF GROUP A AND GROUP B BOOKS RECOMMENDED OR NOT RECOMMENDED IN VARIOUS SELECTION AIDS 51
11. NUMBER AND PERCENT OF GROUP A AND GROUP B BOOKS CLASSIFIED BY TOTAL NUMBER OF FAVORABLE REVIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS RECEIVED 53
12. NUMBER AND PERCENT OF GROUP I AND GROUP II BOOKS CLASSIFIED BY TOTAL NUMBER OF FAVORABLE REVIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS RECEIVED 54
13. GROUP A AND GROUP B BOOKS CLASSIFIED INTO 101 SUBJECT CATEGORIES 59
14. ALL PUBLISHERS OF GROUP A AND GROUP B BOOKS AND THE NUMBER OF BOOKS PUBLISHED BY EACH OF THEM . 64
15. CONTROVERSIAL BOOKS AND THREE SOURCES WHICH RECOMMENDED EACH OF THEM 78
16. NUMBER OF GROUP A AND GROUP B LIBRARIANS WHO WERE ACQUAINTED WITH EACH OF THE FOURTEEN CONTROVERSIAL BOOKS 79

LIST OF TABLES (contd.)

Table Page

17. NUMBER OF LIBRARIANS WHO APPROVED OR DISAPPROVED OF CONTROVERSIAL BOOKS WITH WHICH THEY WERE FAMILIAR 81

18. HOLDINGS OF CONTROVERSIAL BOOKS IN GROUP I LIBRARIES (THOSE WHOSE LIBRARIANS HAD EXPRESSED APPROVAL OF SUCH BOOKS) AND IN GROUP II LIBRARIES (THOSE WHOSE LIBRARIANS HAD EXPRESSED DISAPPROVAL) 83

19. NUMBER OF GROUP I AND GROUP II LIBRARIES WHICH HELD CONTROVERSIAL BOOKS 85

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure Page

1. FOUR-CELL CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR CHI-SQUARE TEST OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NUMBER OF GROUP A AND GROUP B LIBRARIANS WHO USED MORE THAN OR FEWER THAN THE MEAN NUMBER OF SELECTION AIDS USED BY ALL 20 LIBRARIANS 32

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The professional educational attainments of American librarians vary a great deal. At one end of the scale, there are a considerable number of librarians who have had no library science training at all, while at the other end there are those who have completed several years of such training. Generally, it is assumed that, other things being equal, there is some relationship between library science education and the effectiveness of librarians, but there has been little research which tests this assumption. Agnes Reagan commented as follows on the lack of information about the differences between library school graduates and non-graduates:

> . . . we seem to have very little objective evidence to show how in their day-to-day performance on the job the library school graduate and the non-library school graduate compare. Generally speaking, I would guess that the differences are more pronounced for some types of positions and levels of responsibility than for others. Certainly more information on this subject would be helpful both in educating librarians and in staffing libraries.[1]

This present study was designed to provide some objective evidence of the value of library school education by comparing library school graduates with librarians who had little or no library science education in order to find out whether the former performed better than the latter according to certain accepted principles and practices of book selection.

The value of library school education has been debated for many years. One of the early critics was William F. Poole who objected to the founding of the library school at Columbia on the grounds that the best education for librarianship could be obtained by work experience in a "well-managed library," and that the necessary training could not be "imparted by lectures."[2]

In 1916 an anonymous critic used the pages of Public Libraries to describe his or her experiences with library school graduates as follows:

> It was a combination of crass ignorance about elementary things--accessioning--accuracy in cataloging--of course they [the graduates] did not know our subjects--but they made no attempt to learn our catalogs. Their total lack of appreciation of the book and their utter insubordination, want of will in discipline was most trying. They were not worth a dollar a day; not so much to us as our sewing girl I have taken on from the binding room and who is now working up in the library. They did not know enough to know how ignorant they were of common things.[3]

Although the value of professional education for librarianship is more widely recognized today than in former times, strong criticism of such education continues to appear occasionally in the literature. Patricia Paylore wrote in a 1957 issue of the Wilson Library Bulletin that "contemporary formal library education has taken the heart out of librarianship."[4] Following issues of the Bulletin contained letters with comments on Paylore's article--some of the writers defending and others attacking library school education.[5]

Daniel Gore, currently one of the more intemperate critics of library education, expressed the idea that library work is mainly clerical and therefore librarians probably do not need professional education. He wrote the following:

> Most library jobs are, or ought to be, strictly clerical, and Melvil Dewey himself was conscious of this fact when he chose to orient the first library school towards "technical" (that is clerical) rather than professional training . . . . The library school curriculum today is not significantly different from the curriculum of Dewey's early school; yet the schools now claim, as Dewey did not, to be giving professional, nay scientific training, and they confer a master of science degree to prove that they have done this. What they are in fact doing is preparing students to perform clerical tasks in libraries, with often nothing more substantial than a library school degree (and double the pay) to distinguish them from the authentic clerks who are also performing clerical tasks.[6]

Gore argued that professional librarians need types of knowledge which cannot be imparted in library schools. He wrote:

> Legitimately professional work in a library requires a broad and thorough knowledge of books, a maturity of judgment based on this knowledge, a capacity for supervising the work of others, and a productive imagination. With these things the library schools have nothing to do. At best they can produce only seemingly harmless drudges. At worst, they confer spurious professional degrees that enable persons without other qualifications to assume "professional" posts in which they can set about wasting public funds on operations which they never understand well enough to conduct efficiently. . . .[7]

One of the strongest of recent defenders of library school education is Verner Clapp, himself not a library school product. Clapp wrote that academic training in library science is "almost indispensable for an understanding of the ideals, the mission, the full scope of library work."[8] He also wrote the following comment on the ability of librarians without professional training:

> I believe it is possible for non-library school people to do useful work in libraries. But although I cannot prove this, I am positive that they could in every case do better work with library school training.[9]

Ralph Parker expressed the view that many of the strongest critics of library schools are librarians who have not attended such schools themselves. Discussing various "ports of entry" into librarianship, he noted that of those who become professional librarians without having attended library schools, many become vocal critics of those schools. His comment is the following:

> Some who enter through this port have recognized the value of professional education and have formalized their professional status. But others from this group of accidental librarians have become the most vocal critics of library education and have resisted. Their attitude is defensive of their own qualifications and is usually verbalized as glorification of broad literary knowledge, disparagement of statistics and scientific management and an appeal to the emotional rather than to the intellectual demands of librarianship.[10]

Previous Research on the Relationship Between Education and Job Performance

There have been a considerable number of studies of the relationship between education and success in particular occupations and professions other than library science, a few of which are discussed below. Most of the investigators have found a low or moderate positive relationship between the two variables; a minority of the investigators have discovered a stronger relationship.

In 1928 Charles Jacobs reported on his study to find out "wherein the education of the more effective and the less effective teachers differ." Principals ranked teachers, and Jacobs selected the upper and lower quartiles for study. He discovered that "the subjects which are directly applicable to the work of the teachers in the first six grades have had a rather dominant influence in producing effective teachers in those grades." Those subjects were primary education, general methods, and practice teaching.[11] As with other studies which utilize rankings by supervisors, this one might be criticized on the grounds that supervisors may not always be the best judges of the performance of workers, i.e., that personal prejudice may color the rankings.

David Ryans studied the relationship between the amount of education and the success of the teachers as measured by ratings done by observers. He studied the following three groups of teachers:

1. those with less than four years of college
2. those with four-five years of college
3. those with six or more years of college

He discovered that the relationship between amount of education and ratings was very small, not significant at the .05 level or beyond.[12]

Standlee and Popham analyzed the relationship between performance of teachers and professional and academic undergraduate education. Performance was measured in terms of scores on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory and principals' ratings. The investigators found only a small relationship between the variables. They found that only two analyses out of a possible 20 yielded a relationship between preparation and performance that was significant at the 5 percent or higher level of confidence.[13]

In a study conducted at the University of Miami, John Beery found a rather strong relationship between performance of teachers and completion of education courses. His data led him to make the following conclusion:

> On the basis of systematic classroom observations, the fully certified beginning teachers who had completed the prescribed courses in education were consistantly and significantly rated by competent observers to be more effective than the provisionally certified teachers who lacked all or part of the sequence in education courses.[14]

Elizabeth Dalton compared two groups of junior high school teachers--those who had been rated superior by their pupils and those who had been rated inferior. She found that the high group averaged more than twice as many units in educational methods courses as the low group.[15]

William Schill found little relationship between the amount of general education of research and development technicians and job success as measured by upward mobility in their occupation, but he found a strong correlation between mathematical education and success. He wrote:

> The correlations that resulted were 0.234 between educational attainment and occupational success and 0.766 between mathematical attainment and occupational success. This indicates that (provided the assumptions made are proper) a special area of education that is functionally related to an occupation is highly correlated with success in that occupation, while general educational attainment is not.[16]

In studies of the relationship between upward mobility in occupations and professional or "functional" education one might raise the question as to whether those with superior education are promoted because they are really better workers or simply because they have better education and it is assumed that they should be more qualified. For example, were the technicians with considerable mathematical education promoted because they were better technicians or simply because their supervisors knew they had had more mathematics training and they should be better technicians.

There have been very few studies of the relationship between library science education and success in librarianship. Those investigators who have studied this problem have found a low or moderate relationship.

Irene May Doyle studied the relationship between library school grades and success and found a correlation of .36.[17]

Stuart Baillie studied a group of graduates of the library school of the University of Denver. Among other things he hypothesized that the job success as measured by supervisors' ratings could be predicted by the graduate grade point average. He found a low positive correlation of .27.[18]

William Nash investigated the communications patterns of head librarians of Illinois public libraries and discovered a relationship between those patterns and amount of library science education. Nash identified the following four types of librarians:

> Isolate.--A librarian who has no interaction with others on matters pertaining to the administration of his library.
>
> Localite.--A librarian who has the major part of his contacts pertaining to the administration of his library with local non-librarian individuals.
>
> Library localite.--A librarian who has the major part of his contacts pertaining to the administration of his library with local librarians.
>
> Library cosmopolite.--A librarian who has the major part of his contacts pertaining to the administration of his library with non-local librarians.[19]

He found that a considerably greater percentage of librarians in the "library cosmopolite" category had undergone a year of library science education than had librarians in the other categories. He wrote:

> Differences in amounts of formal library science training on the basis of communications category are significant at the 5 percent level. . . . Formal library science training is defined as full term length library science courses offered by a college or

university. Short courses, institutes, workshops, and apprenticeships were not considered as formal library science instruction for purposes of this study. The library cosmopolite group contained 66.67 percent who had received such instruction. The following had some formal library training: isolates, 54.54 percent; localites, 41.75 percent; and library localites, 22.22 percent.[20]

In her study of censorship in public and school libraries of California, Marjorie Fisk found that librarians with formal library science education were more liberal regarding the selection of controversial books than those without such education. For example, she discovered that 41 percent of the professionally trained librarians were likely to disregard controversiality in selecting library materials compared with 29 percent of those without such training.[21]

J. Periam Danton did a study in order to determine what factors were related to building quality collections in college libraries. The quality of the collections was measured by checking holdings against the then new list of books for college libraries compiled by Charles Shaw. He selected the eleven highest-ranking and the thirteen lowest-ranking libraries and studied various factors including the education of the librarians. He found that librarians of the highest-ranking libraries had considerably more library science education than the other librarians. For example, nine of the former group had completed at least one year of library school compared with only one of the latter group.[22] The question arises as to the validity of the Shaw list, or any other standard booklist, for measuring quality of collections. It is entirely conceivable that a library might have a good book collection even though it has relatively few titles on a given booklist since no list contains all the good books. By using a booklist, however, such a library would be rated inferior and receive no credit for fine books which do not appear on the list. The Danton study may also have certain limitations since part of it was done by mail questionnaire.

Ruth Warncke used the lists of books included in "Suggestions for Small Libraries" published in the ALA Booklist for January to December, 1960, and titles on the list, ALA Notable Books of 1960, and checked them against the holdings of 126 Missouri libraries. She compared the holdings of four groups of libraries on the basis of number of professional staff members; those having no professional staff members; those having one to five; those having six to ten; and those with more. She found that a "significantly larger proportion of libraries employing professional staff members than of libraries employing none added these titles to their collection."[23] It could be argued, however, that the libraries with professional staff members had more of the desirable books because they were generally larger, richer libraries and not because they had professional staff members.

It seems that the better studies support the contention that there is a small or moderate relationship between education and job performance. One of the best studies cited above is the one reported by Standlee and Popham. Using the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory as well as principal's ratings, they found a very slight positive relationship between education and success. Beery found a strong relationship between education and effectiveness of teachers. The studies by Doyle, Baillie, and Danton are not above criticism, but they seem to be the best studies of the effect of library school education on success of librarians. Those three investigators found some relationship, but a relatively small relationship, between library school training and success. The results of the previous research in library science and in other fields led the present investigator to expect that he would find a low or moderate positive relationship between library school education and competence in book selection.

Footnotes to Chapter I

[1] Agnes L. Reagan, "Discussion," Seven Questions About the Profession of Librarianship: The Twenty-sixth Annual Conference of the Graduate Library School, June 21-23, 1961, ed. Philip H. Ennis and Howard W. Winger (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 56.

[2] American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1883," Library Journal, VIII (September-October, 1883), 288.

[3] "A Wail of Despair," Public Libraries, XXI (May, 1916), 215-16.

[4] Patricia Paylore, "The Heart of the Matter," Wilson Library Bulletin, XXXI (February, 1957), 455.

[5] See "'The Heart of the Matter' Indeed," Wilson Library Bulletin, XXXI (April, 1957), 632-35 and "'The Heart of the Matter' Again," Wilson Library Bulletin, XXXI (May, 1957), 733-34.

[6] Daniel Gore, "The Mismanagement of College Libraries: A View from the Inside," AAUP Bulletin, LII (March, 1966), 47.

[7] Ibid., 48.

[8] Verner Clapp, "School of Experience," Library Journal, LXXXV (May, 1960), 1750.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ralph H. Parker, "Ports of Entry to Librarianship," Seven Questions about the Profession of Librarianship: The Twenty-sixth Annual Conference of the Graduate Library School, June 21-23, 1961, ed. Philip H. Ennis and Howard W. Winger. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 50.

[11] Charles L. Jacobs, The Relation of the Teacher's Education to Her Effectiveness (Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 277, 1928), pp. 85-89.

[12] David S. Ryans, "A Study of the Extent of Association of Certain Professional and Personal Data with Judged Effectiveness of Teacher Behavior," Journal of Experimental Education, XX (September, 1951), 73-77.

[13] Lloyd S. Standlee and W. James Popham, "Preparation and Performance of Teachers," Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, XXXIV (November, 1958), 40.

[14] John R. Beery, Professional Preparation and Effectiveness of Beginning Teachers (Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami, 1960), p. 54.

[15] Elizabeth L. Dalton, What Makes Effective Teachers for Young Adolescents? (Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1962), p. 27.

[16] William J. Schill, "Education and Occupational Success," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI (January, 1963), 444.

[17] Irene May Doyle, "Library School Marks and Success in Library Service" (Unpublished master's thesis, Graduate School of Library Science, University of Illinois, Urbana, 1931), p.37.

[18] Stuart Baillie, Library School and Job Success (Studies in Librarianship, No. 3, Denver: Graduate School of Librarianship, University of Denver, 1964), p. 86.

[19] William V. Nash, "Characteristics of Administrative Heads of Public Libraries in Various Communications Categories," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana, 1964), pp. 70-71.

[20] Ibid., pp. 91-93.

[21] Marjorie Fiske, Book Selection and Censorship (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959), pp. 67-68.

[22] J. Periam Danton, "The Selection of Books for College Libraries," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1935), pp. 49-50.

[23] Ruth Warncke, "Public Library Service in Missouri, Part I, Adult Services," in Public Library Service in Missouri: A Survey, ed. Gretchen Knief Schenk. Jefferson City, Mo.: Missouri State Library, 1964, p. 99.

CHAPTER II

OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY OF THIS STUDY

This study was designed to compare the effectiveness of two groups of librarians in selecting adult books for public libraries; one group consisted of librarians with a degree in library science and the other group of those with little or no professional education. Several hypotheses are stated which relate to the contention that, other things being equal, librarians with a degree in library science are superior book selectors for public library collections in comparison to librarians with little or no training in library science. These hypotheses are based on the assumption that librarians who have graduated from library school have learned more about library work from their professional education than untrained librarians have learned from library experience. Previous research, discussed in Chapter I, would lead one to expect that this assumption is correct since the majority of investigators have found some relationship between education and occupational success although the relationship discovered has often been a relatively weak one.

Most of the hypotheses tested are based on principles and practices of book selection for public libraries which are widely accepted in the library profession and are believed to lead to the building of useful library collections. The literature of book selection, including library standards, was thoroughly studied in order to single out those principles. It must be pointed out that not all of these principles and practices are accepted by all librarians, and some are more generally accepted than others. The purpose of this study might be stated in this manner: to discover whether professionally educated librarians follow accepted principles and practices of book selection for public libraries more carefully than untrained librarians. The following hypotheses were tested:

1. Librarians with a degree in library science use a greater number of book selection aids than librarians with little or no training in library science.

2. Librarians with a degree in library science make greater use of and prefer selection aids prepared especially for libraries to a greater extent than librarians with little or no training in library science.

3. Librarians with a degree in library science purchase general books from salesmen and subscribe to book clubs and commercial rental libraries (which allow little opportunity to evaluate books received) to a lesser extent than librarians with little or no training in library science.

4. A greater proportion of books selected by degree librarians are recommended by current reviewing media and retrospective bibliographies than of those purchased by librarians with little or no training in library science.

5. Librarians with a degree in library science select more balanced collections of books, i.e., books with more even subject coverage, than those with little or no training in library science.

6. Librarians with a degree in library science have more favorable attitudes towards controversial books than librarians with little or no training in library science.

7. Librarians with a library degree purchase a greater number of recommended controversial books than librarians with little or no training in library science.

Besides testing hypotheses which relate quality of performance to library school education, several alternative hypotheses were tested in order to determine whether certain other factors were more strongly or less strongly related to high performance. Years of library experience, educational level of the community, and graduation from one of the better library schools as compared with graduation from other library schools were analyzed. If it were found that these other factors had a smaller relationship to success in selection than library school education, the case for saying that success was related to professional education would be strengthened. The destruction of alternative hypotheses is a traditional way of strengthening the original hypothesis.

Cause of the Differences Between the Two Groups

The causal elements proposed for the hypotheses are related to library school education. Degree librarians would be expected to use a greater number of selection aids and to prefer aids prepared especially for libraries because they have been systematically exposed to a great number of aids in library school courses, including many standard library-directed aids. Untrained librarians, on the other hand, would presumably learn about selection aids more or less haphazardly and thus would be familiar with fewer aids than degree librarians and probably would be more familiar with aids which are widely circulated among the general public than with those prepared for libraries. Library school graduates would be expected to make fewer purchases of general books directly from salesmen and to use commercial book clubs and lending libraries, which do not give librarians the opportunity to evaluate most of the books received, because library school graduates have been taught the importance of evaluating books which are placed in library collections, while the non-graduates have not had the benefit of such instruction. It would be expected that a greater proportion of books purchased by degree librarians than of those purchased by the other librarians would be recommended by reviewing media and catalogs of books most appropriate for libraries because the former group of librarians make greater use of selection aids which contain evluations and because they are exposed, in library school courses, to the principle of selection regarding the importance of adhering to standards of quality in selection. The former group of librarians would be expected to purchase more "well-rounded" collections because they have studied the importance of meeting all kinds of reading interests which cover many different subjects. Librarians with a professional degree would be expected to have more favorable attitudes towards controversial books and to purchase a greater number of controversial materials because they have studied the liberal statements about controversial materials adopted by professional library organizations. The other librarians probably have not had the benefit of such study.

Assumptions and Principles

In this investigation it is assumed that the hypotheses, with the possible exception of two of them, are based on valid principles of book selection and can therefore be used to judge the competence of book selectors. The extent of the validity of these principles has an effect on the value of the study. If, for example, it could be proved that most of the principles used do not lead to good book selection, it could be shown that the criteria used for measuring the competence of book selectors are improper.

The first hypothesis is based on the principle that the effectiveness of the book selector is positively related to the number of selection aids used. The rationale for this is that any one selection aid covers only a small proportion of the books published annually, any one of which might be a desirable purchase for a public library. A librarian has no way of knowing which of these thousands of books may be appropriate unless he evaluates them personally, which would be impossible because of the vast number published, or reads notices and reviews of them. His chances of finding such notices are directly related to the number of aids used. Moreover, it is better to read several evaluations of a given book than to rely entirely on one reviewer's evaluation. The number of evaluations available on a given book is directly related to the number of selection aids available since one aid usually contains only one evaluation of a given book.

A number of authorities on book selection have recommended that librarians use a variety of selection tools rather than rely on just a few. Helen Haines noted that "broad acquaintance with review periodicals and discriminating use of book reviews are essential in book selection."[1] She also argued that librarians should not depend on one reviewer but should compare the opinions of several before selecting a given book. She wrote that "especially in selection for small libraries, there should be no complete dependence on any single review."[2] Orrilla Blackshear recommended that a small library should own all of the "basic book selection aids" which include the various Wilson catalogs.[3] She also recommended that librarians use library reviewing aids, such as Booklist and Library Journal and a number of general periodicals such as Atlantic, Harper's, The New York Times Book Review, and Saturday Review.[4]

Hypothesis 2 is based on the principle that aids prepared especially for libraries are more desirable for selecting books for library purchase than aids prepared for other audiences such as the general public. This principle is defended on the grounds that library-directed aids are designed especially for library use while the other aids are designed for some other audience. It would therefore seem that although both types of aids might be useful in evaluating books for library purchase, the library-directed aids would be more useful. Few authorities have commented on this principle, but some have voiced support of it. Blackshear, for example, argued that there are certain selection aids which "are of prime importance to small libraries." Those she lists are all library-directed aids, such as the Wilson catalogs, Booklist, and Library Journal.[5] She wrote that there are other aids which are useful for "supplementary reviewing information." These are non-library-directed aids and include the book sections of general magazines and newspapers, such as the Saturday Review and The New York Times Book Review.[6]

Hypothesis 3 contains the assumption that it is not particularly desirable for librarians to purchase general books from salesmen or to subscribe to book clubs or commercial lending libraries which generally do not provide for librarian evaluation of books before they are sent. This reasoning is based on the principle that each book should be evaluated before being added to a library's collection. When salesmen visit libraries to sell books, librarians do not have the opportunity to check reviews or other evaluations of the books offered, but must usually rely on salesmen's evaluations. Commercial lending libraries are also in business to make a profit and cannot be expected to make unbiased evaluations of books sent to libraries; nor can they be expected to be knowledgeable of the book needs of libraries. In the literature of book selection, it is usually asserted that all books added to a library collection should be carefully evaluated, and in general, only those which meet certain standards of quality should be added.

Hypothesis 4 is based on the principle that books purchased for public libraries should meet certain standards of quality. It is assumed that evaluations made of books by library reviewing media and catalogs and by general reviewing media are usually the best evaluations available of the appropriateness of books for public library collections. Since librarians in small libraries can personally read and evaluate only a very small proportion of books which they purchase, they must rely on the published evaluations. Moreover, no one librarian who selects books in many different subject areas (and most librarians who select books for small public libraries do so) can be an expert in more than one or two of these areas; therefore, it would seem most advisable to rely on printed evaluations since reviewers generally specialize in particular types of literature.

The principle that standards of quality should be maintained in public library book selection has wide support in the literature. The profession, through the American Library Association, officially endorsed this belief by adopting the following principle in 1956:

> Materials should meet high standards of quality in content, expression, and format.[7]

The principle is discussed in these words:

> The library continually seeks the best materials to serve purposes and needs. Factual accuracy, effective expression, significance of subject, sincerity and responsibility of opinion--these and other factors must be considered and at times balanced one against the other. Durable and attractive paper, binding, and print are desirable in books. For nonbook materials, considerations of physical and technical excellence, as shown in quality of photography and sound, must be considered. Quality of materials must be related to the other two basic standards of selection, purpose, and need.[8]

It has sometimes been asserted that inferior books should be purchased if there is an interest in such material, but the profession has officially endorsed the idea that standards of quality should be maintained when meeting reading interests. The 1956 standards contain the principle that needs and interests of people should be met "within standards of purpose and quality."[9] Helen Haines also expressed this idea in her work on book selection. Arguing that librarians can almost always satisfy reading interests by purchasing quality books, she wrote the following comment:

> With a wide and discriminating knowledge of books, it is almost always possible to choose a book that on its own plane possesses both value and interest.[10]

Orrilla Blackshear wrote that "all materials that are required for the library should meet high standards of quality and content, expression, and format."[11] She also argued that rental collections should meet the same standards as books in the regular library collection.[12]

Hypothesis 5 is based on the belief that it is desirable to select a balanced collection of books rather than to neglect certain areas. By balanced collection it is not meant that the same proportion of books should be selected in each of a number of subject categories, the same proportion in art, science, etc., but simply that each of many subjects should be represented in selections. The belief in building balanced collections in public libraries perhaps has less general support in the profession than most of the other principles used as the basis for hypotheses in this study. Some librarians feel that it is more important for a public library to satisfy known reader interests, than to build a balanced collection. Drury, for example, implied that reader demand is the best basis for book selection.[13] On the other hand, other authorities have stated that balance is important. Apparently, Haines did not believe that complete proportional balance was desirable, but she did feel that each of many subjects should have some representation in the library collection.[14]

The present writer believes that some balance in selection is necessary since any public library community, except the very smallest or most unusual, is bound to contain a very wide variety of reading interests; therefore, the library with a balanced collection will be able the more readily to meet these many interests when requested to do so than a library which has built its collection on known reading interests.

The last two hypotheses are based on the theory that libraries should contain materials on controversial topics and that books should not be rejected because they are controversial. The principles of intellectual freedom have widespread support in the literature of book selection and of library administration. The public library standards of 1956 contain the following principle:

> The library collection should contain opposing views on controversial topics of interest to the people.[15]

The principle is discussed as follows:

> The collection must contain the various opinions which apply to important, complicated, and controversial questions, including unpopular and unorthodox positions.[16]

The Interim Standards for Small Public Libraries contains this principle:

> The library collection should provide opposing views on controversial topics.[17]

The principle is discussed in these words:

> The public library does not promote particular beliefs or views. It does provide, either from its own or borrowed resources, materials which the individual can examine and use to make his own decisions.[18]

The "Freedom to Read" statement adopted by the American Library Association and the American Book Publishers Council contains the following comments on the responsibility of publishers and librarians:

> We believe that every American community must jealously guard the freedom to publish and to circulate, in order to preserve its own freedom to read. We believe that publishers and librarians have a profound responsibility to give validity to that freedom to read by making it possible for the reader to choose freely from a variety of offerings.[19]

The statement also notes that "it is in the public interest for publishers and librarians to make available the widest diversity of views and expressions, including those which are unorthodox or unpopular with the majority."[20]

The statement also mentions controversial materials which deal frankly with sex. It contains the following sentences:

> The present laws dealing with obscenity should be vigorously enforced. Beyond that, there is no place in our society for extra-legal efforts to coerce the taste of others, to confine adults to the reading matter deemed suitable for adolescents, or to inhibit the efforts of writers to achieve artistic expression.[21]

Librarians Selected for Study

As stated previously, 20 librarians were to be selected as subjects for study, ten having a degree in library science and ten having little or no library science education. Before cases could be selected for study, it was necessary to do a preliminary questionnaire survey of a large group of librarians in order to identify two groups for study, the groups being similar in sex, age, general education, and years of experience, but differing greatly in library science education. The questionnaire was also used to identify situations in which only one librarian was responsible for adult book selection. (Since the questionnaire was used only to identify cases to study, the data received from questionnaire returns are not analyzed in this report.)

Questionnaires were sent to 236 public libraries serving populations of 10,000 to 35,000 in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, and Wisconsin. Libraries of this size group were surveyed for the following reasons. First of all, it was necessary to have libraries large enough to have sufficient funds to purchase selection aids desired by librarians so that the lack of aids could not be attributable to lack of funds, and it was felt that many smaller libraries would not have such funds. Libraries serving more than 35,000 population were not surveyed because it was felt that in many of them more than one librarian would be engaged in adult book selection. Only five Midwestern states were included in the survey so that the investigator would not have to visit distant libraries.

A packet of questionnaires was mailed to the head librarian of each of the 236 libraries. Each packet contained a letter addressed to the head librarian which requested him to fill out one questionnaire himself and to have every other librarian who devoted at least half of his work time to professional duties do the same. Returns were received from 188 libraries or 79.7 percent of those polled. The total number of librarians responding was 445, and it was from this total that the two groups of ten each were selected for study.

The questionnaires were analyzed, and an attempt was made to select two groups of librarians who differed in library science education, members of one group having a library school degree and the other having little or no library science training, but who were similar in the personal characteristics mentioned above. Librarians in both groups were also to be similar in that they did all the adult book selection for their libraries, in that their libraries had similar per capita book budgets, and in that their libraries were located in communities of similar educational and socioeconomic level. Similar situations were selected so that differences other than amount of library science education would not unduly affect the results of this study.

Even though a large number of librarians was surveyed by questionnaire, it was not possible to match the two groups exactly on the relevant characteristics, but it was possible to match them rather closely. Hereafter the two groups will be referred to as Group A and Group B; Group A being those who had little or no library science education. All the librarians studied were women. The average age for Group A librarians was 52.8 and for Group B, 47.8. Nine Group A librarians and all ten Group B librarians were 40 years of age or older. The number of years of library

Correction - Page nineteen, second sentence in paragraph four should read: Hereafter, the two groups will be referred to as Group A and Group B; Group A being those librarians who had a degree in library science and Group B being those who had little or no library science education.

experience ranged from 4 to 43 for Group A, with a mean of 24.5. The range for Group B was 7 to 42, and the mean was 19.5. There was a five year difference in the average number of years of experience of Group A and Group B librarians. The difference was tested in order to determine whether it was greater than might be due to chance. If the difference was significant, Group A would have an advantage in years of experience. The difference was not significant, however, according to the chi-square test. The total number of years of library experience of all 20 librarians was added, and the mean was calculated. The total was 441, and the average 22.05. A chi-square test was performed in order to discover whether the number of Group A librarians who had worked in libraries more than the mean of 22.05 years was significantly greater than the number of Group B librarians who had done so. A chi-square of only .8 was obtained, however, and this figure is not significant at the .05 level.[22]

The average number of years of education completed by Group A librarians was 15.9, and by Group B librarians, 14.7. Of the librarians in Group A, four had a master's degree in library science, five had a fifth-year bachelor's, and one had a fourth-year bachelor's. Of those in Group B, six had no courses in library science, two had attended a summer school session conducted by a state library agency, one had attended a Chautauqua course, and one had a college extension course in children's literature.

All the librarians selected for the study were chief librarians except one, and all had complete responsibility and authority in book selection. The one librarian who was not a head librarian was questioned thoroughly on this point, and she insisted that she selected all the adult and young adult books except for some in the children's collection and had the final authority in selection. The head librarian in that library confined herself to other matters and never interfered in book selection, according to the book selector.

No attempt was made to match libraries since such matching would probably be impossible and also unnecessary for this study. It was decided, however, to select libraries with book budgets of at least $2,000 on the assumption that such budgets would make it possible for librarians to subscribe to a number of selection aids if they so desired. One budget was actually only $1,922, but this seemed to be sufficiently close to $2,000. The figures for 1964 were used since those were the latest available. Total book expenditures are shown in Table 1. Average per capita book expenditure for Group A was $.48 and for Group B $.45.

TABLE 1

EXPENDITURES OF LIBRARIES--1964

Library	Population 1960	Total Expenditures	Total Book Expenditures	Per Capita Book Expenditures
GROUP A				
1	10,973	$ 50,969	$ 3,507	$ .32
2	20,429	38,374	9,358	.46
3	16,732	41,081	6,833	.41
4	24,107	50,187	10,608	.44
5	23,315	36,623	8,379	.36
6	21,690	52,072	5,708	.26
7	16,316	66,059	7,447	.46
8	10,687	65,910	8,232	.77
9	29,993	88,256	22,405	.75
10	24,312	76,789	13,868	.57
Mean	19,855	56,632	9,635	.48
GROUP B				
11	11,232	17,719	1,992	.18
12	18,883	54,107	6,891	.36
13	11,543	29,624	5,819	.50
14	25,100	74,668	16,708	.67
15	11,651	31,875	10,438	.90
16	20,517	27,937	4,201	.20
17	14,888	21,638	4,864	.33
18	12,490	16,409	3,664	.29
19	12,408	54,233	8,905	.72
20	11,694	28,282	4,391	.38
Mean	15,041	35,649	6,787	.45

Table 2 shows that the two groups of communities were quite similar in the characteristics considered. The median educational attainment of residents of 25 years or older was 11.8 for Group A communities and 12.0 for Group B communities. The median family income averaged $7,698 for Group A and $7,816 for Group B communities. In population Group A communities averaged 19,855 and Group B 15,041.

TABLE 2

COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS

Community	Population 1960	Median Education of Those 25 and Over	Median Family Income
GROUP A			
1	10,973	12.0	$ 7,385
2	20,429	11.7	8,288
3	16,732	9.5	6,580
4	24,107	12.0	8,761
5	23,315	12.2	5,786
6	21,690	10.0	5,733
7	16,316	10.8	5,458
8	10,687	12.9	10,811
9	29,993	13.5	8,946
10	24,312	12.9	9,227
Mean	19,855	11.8	7,698
GROUP B			
11	11,232	10.5	6,165
12	18,883	13.3	10,763
13	11,543	11.3	5,535
14	25,100	12.4	9,377
15	11,651	10.8	6,032
16	20,517	10.6	5,999
17	14,888	10.5	8,167
18	12,490	12.3	7,034
19	12,408	13.2	12,257
20	11,694	14.8	6,826
Mean	15,041	12.0	7,816

Methods of Investigation

Once the two groups of librarians were chosen for study, several devices were constructed to test the hypotheses. These included an interview schedule, a librarian's guide to the interview, a checklist of selection aids, and a checklist of controversial books.

The interview schedule was used to introduce librarians to the nature of the investigation and to test several of the hypotheses stated above. Librarians were asked about which selection aids they used and preferred and to what extent they purchased books from book clubs or salesmen or rented books from commercial agencies, and to what extent they selected the books they received from rental agencies. Librarians were also asked about their responsibility for book selection. They were asked whether they selected all the books purchased for their adult collections or whether someone else also did some of this selection, and they were asked whether they had final authority for selection or sometimes had to ask approval from someone else, such as library board members. Only those librarians who did all the selection and had final authority were included in the study since it would be difficult to fix responsibility in other types of situations. The librarian's guide to the interview contained major questions and had the purpose of helping the librarian follow the course of the interview.

The checklist of book selection aids was constructed from lists of aids given in such works as Blackshear's Building and Maintaining the Small Library Collection,[23] Carter and Bonk's Building Library Collections,[24] and Winchell's Guide to Reference Books.[25] This checklist was not meant to be a list of the "best" selection aids or to be a complete or definitive list of aids but simply to serve as a reminder to librarians in case they had forgotten particular aids which they sometimes used. Librarians were first asked to name aids of various types which they used, such as library periodicals and general magazines and newspapers. Then they were given the checklist.

The checklist of controversial books was constructed from accounts of censorship problems published in the Newsletter of the Intellectual Freedom Committee of the American Library Association, the most complete reporting service of this kind. All issues of the Newsletter for 1960 through 1964 were consulted, and the titles of all books mentioned which had caused censorship problems and which had been published from 1960 through 1964 were noted. The titles were then checked against the following reviewing tools: Booklist and Subscription Books Bulletin, Fiction Catalog, Library Journal, New York Times Book Review, Saturday Review, Standard Catalog for High School Libraries, and Virginia Kirkus. Those titles which had three or more favorable reviews in these media were kept on the checklist. In this way a number of controversial books which were not favorably reviewed were eliminated from the checklist on the theory that they would be less likely to be appropriate, although not necessarily inappropriate, for public libraries than those which had received favorable reviews.

In addition to the printed devices described above, another method of investigation was used to test hypotheses four and five. A sample was taken of the 1965 selections of each librarian and the eight book selection aids mentioned above were consulted in order to find out what proportion of the purchases were recommended. This "inductive" method of evaluating collections would seem to be superior to the more common "deductive" method of checking a library's collection against standard bibliographies since the latter method ignores books which are in the library's collection but not listed in the bibliographies. Herbert Goldhor, who used the inductive method in a study of book circulation at the Evansville (Indiana) Public Library, wrote the following comments in comparing these two methods of collection evaluation:

> It may be of interest to record some of the data on the use in this present study of several book-evaluation tools in checking a given library's collection. This method is different from the traditional procedure for evaluating a book collection, viz., picking a standard list of books and ascertaining how many of its titles are held. Such a procedure ignores books on the shelves but not on the list used for checking (except by implication); some of these books may be as good as (or even better than) some on the list.[26]

Visits to Libraries

Each librarian selected for study was called about a week prior to the proposed visit to the library. She was requested to participate in the study and given brief details of its nature and purpose. The major purpose of testing differences between graduate librarians and those with very little or no training was not mentioned because it was felt that such information might influence the librarians' replies to interview questions or might cause some to refuse to participate at all. All of the 20 librarians selected for study were used in the final analysis except one. When that library was visited, it was discovered that two librarians did adult book selection. The interview was completed as a courtesy to the librarians, but the results were not used. Another librarian was then selected from the questionnaire respondents, contacted and visited. It was found that she alone did adult book selection in her library.

Insofar as possible each visit was made similar to all the other visits since differences in methods of procedure might have an effect on the results of the interviews. The following procedures were followed in each library. First of all the librarian was interviewed. At the beginning of the interview, the librarian was told that there were no right or wrong answers to questions and was urged to express her frank opinions. She was also assured that her answers would be kept confidential. It was hoped that this introduction would minimize any tendency for the librarians to exaggerate or express opinions which they felt the interviewer expected.

After the interview, the investigator asked the librarian's permission to make a list of a sample of books selected during 1965. It was explained that we were interested in the kinds of books which librarians select for small public libraries. All the librarians granted permission for such a sample to be taken. Most seemed very happy to grant such permission; two or three seemed somewhat reluctant but did not refuse.

The sample consisted of books in each library's collection which were published and purchased during 1965. In most of the libraries the sample was taken from the dictionary card catalog. A sample of one book was taken from each nth inch of the catalog. For example, if the adult catalog had 26 or 27 drawers, a sample of one book was taken from each four inches of catalog cards, there being an average of about eight or nine inches of cards per drawer in most libraries. A ruler was used to measure four inches, then the bibliographic information on the first card beyond the four inches which bore a 1965 publication date was noted and included in the sample. Shelf lists were used in the few libraries which had standard shelf lists and in one library in which the cards in the dictionary catalog did not contain publication dates. It was felt that a sample from either the card catalog or the shelf list, if the filing was up to date, should provide a reliable sample of the total of 1965 books purchased during the period in question, since both catalogs and shelf lists are complete files of library book holdings. A sample of only 25 books was taken in Libraries 11 and 17, the first two libraries studied. After discussion with a statistician, it was decided to take samples of 50 books from each of the remaining 18 libraries since a larger sample might be more reliable. The investigator intended to return to the first two libraries after he had visited the other 18 in order to take larger samples, but he did not because, during the intervening period, the most recent issues of the Fiction Catalog and Standard

Catalog for Public Libraries had been published. The two librarians might have received the catalogs and used them in selection and therefore have had an unfair advantage over the other librarians who had done their selection without the benefit of those catalogs. In most of the computations in this study the two samples of 25 have been given double weight.

Footnotes to Chapter II

[1] Helen E. Haines, Living with Books: The Art of Book Selection (2d ed., New York: Columbia University Press, 1950), p. 99.

[2] Ibid., p. 110.

[3] Orrilla T. Blackshear, Building and Maintaining the Small Library Collection (Chicago: American Library Association, 1963), pp. 3-4.

[4] Ibid., p. 4.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Public Library Service: A Guide to Evaluation with Minimum Standards, Prepared by Co-ordinating Committee on Revision of Public Library Standards, Public Libraries Division, American Library Association (Chicago: American Library Association, 1956), p. 32.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Haines, p. 42.

[11] Blackshear, p. 3.

[12] Ibid., p. 7.

[13] Francis K. W. Drury, Book Selection (Chicago: American Library Association, 1930), p. 243.

[14] Haines, p. 46.

[15] Public Library Service, p. 33.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Interim Standards for Small Public Libraries: Guidelines towards achieving the goals of Public Library Service (Chicago: Public Library Association, a division of the American Library Association, 1963), p. 7.

[18] Ibid.

[19] The Freedom to Read: A Statement Prepared by the Westchester Conference of the American Library Association and the American Book Publishers Council May 2 and 3, 1953 [Chicago: American Library Association, 1953], p. 4.

[20] Ibid., p. 5.

[21] Ibid.

[22] For a discussion of the chi-square test, see pp. 31-33.

[23] Blackshear, p. 4.

[24] Mary Duncan Carter and Wallace J. Bonk, Building Library Collections (2d ed., New York and London: Scarecrow Press, 1964), pp. 60-65.

[25] Constance M. Winchell, Guide to Reference Books (Chicago: American Library Association, 1951), pp. 55-59.

[26] Herbert Goldhor, "Are the Best Books the Most Read?" Library Quarterly, XXIX (October, 1959), 252.

CHAPTER III

USE OF SELECTION AIDS BY GROUP A AND GROUP B LIBRARIANS

The library school graduates and the non-graduates were compared on the matter of number of book selection aids used. In addition, the number of aids used by librarians who had more than the mean number of years of library experience, regardless of their professional education, was compared with the number of aids used by librarians who had fewer than the mean number of years of experience. This was done in order to find out whether the relationship between years of experience and performance was stronger than the relationship between professional education and performance. The graduates and the untrained librarians were compared on their use of and preference for library-directed and non-library-directed selection aids. The two groups were also compared on the amount of purchasing of books from salesmen and subscriptions to book clubs and commercial lending libraries.

One assumption made in this study is that the competence of book selectors can be judged on the basis of the number of book selection tools used. There are thousands of books published annually, any of which might be useful in public library collections; librarians do not know, judging from the titles alone, which of these might be appropriate for their libraries. They must see evaluations of them, or evaluate them personally. A total of 28,595 titles were published in the United States during 1965.[1] The total number of books reviewed in various media is shown in Table 3. Library Journal contained the largest number of reviews--6,127--but this represents only a fraction of the number of books published in the United States alone. Since any given selection aid reviews or lists only a small proportion of these publications, librarians must use a considerable number of aids in order to become acquainted with and to find evaluations of current publications.

It seems logical that the greater the number of selection aids used the greater is the likelihood of discovering an evaluation of a given book. Moreover, it would seem more desirable to read several reviews of a given book than to rely on the opinion of only one reviewer; and the number of reviews

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF REVIEWS IN VARIOUS MEDIA*

Publication	Number of Reviews, 1965
Booklist	2,821
New York Herald Tribune. Book Week	1,610
Library Journal	6,127
New York Times Book Review	2,332
Saturday Review	1,657
Virginia Kirkus	3,973

*SOURCE: The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information, 1966. New York: R.R. Bowker Co., 1966, p. 116.

available on a given work is directly related to the number of selection aids available since each aid generally carries only one evaluation of a particular book. Since it is the purpose of this study to test the contention that library school graduates are better book selectors than librarians with little or no library school education, it was hypothesized that the former group of librarians (Group A librarians) use a greater number of selection aids than the latter group of librarians (Group B librarians). The causal element proposed was library school exposure to selection tools. Library school students are taught about many different selection tools while non-graduates would learn about such tools more or less haphazardly.

The method used to test the hypothesis was the following. Librarians were first asked whether they used any printed book selection aids at all in selecting adult or young adult books. Those who replied in the affirmative, and all did, were then asked whether they used publishers' or jobbers' catalogs in selecting books, and if so, which ones. They were also questioned about their use of aids prepared especially for libraries or bookstores, their use of reviews or notices contained in general magazines and newspapers, and their use of any retrospective catalogs or other types of selection aids. After this questioning, librarians were given a checklist of 24 selection tools and were asked to check which ones they used. The checklist was compiled from an examination of various works on book selection, including Blackshear's Building and Maintaining the Small Library Collection,[2] Carter and Bonk's Building Library Collections,[3] and Winchell's Guide to Reference Books.[4] The checklist was not meant to be a list of the best selection tools, but to remind librarians of tools they might have momentarily forgotten when questioned. After they had finished with the checklist, librarians were asked whether they currently received each of the tools checked. In a very few instances librarians indicated they did not currently receive particular tools. These latter aids were not counted in analyzing data for this study because it was believed that older editions of selection tools would be of little value for current selection, which was the type of selection under study.

Number of Selection Aids Used

The number of selection aids used by each librarian, including local and other newspapers, was tabulated from their replies to the various questions on selection aids used and their checking of the checklist. Group A librarians, on the average, used more aids than Group B librarians. The range in the number of aids used by Group A librarians was 11 to 24, and the mean was 17.6, while the range for Group B librarians was 8 to 19, and the average was 14.0. Figures for the use of local newspapers were then subtracted from the totals on the theory that such publications were not equally available to the 20 librarians interviewed. Figures for Chicago, London, and New York newspapers were retained since these are national or international in circulation. The number of aids used by Group A librarians, after the latter had been done, ranged from 10 to 23, and the mean was 17.1. For Group B the range was 8 to 19, and the mean was 13.3. The mean number of aids used by all 20 librarians was 15.2. Six Group A librarians used more than that mean, and four used fewer; three Group B librarians used more than the mean and seven used fewer. A chi-square was calculated in order to determine whether the number of Group A librarians who used more than the mean number of aids was significantly greater than the number of Group B librarians who did so. The difference was not significant, however, since a chi-square of only .80 was obtained.

The chi-square test is used in order to determine whether obtained differences are significant or no greater than those which would be expected to be due to chance alone. The procedure used to obtain the chi-square in the problem above and in other problems in this study is that recommended by Blalock.[5] The frequencies were entered in the appropriate cells of Figure 1.

	Group A Librarians	Group B Librarians	
Number of Librarians Who Used More Than the Mean Number of Selection Aids	a 5.5 (4.5)	b 3.5 (4.5)	9
Number of Librarians Who Used Fewer Than the Mean Number of Selection Aids	c 4.5 (5.5)	d 6.5 (5.5)	11
	10	10	20

Figure 1. Four-cell contingency table for chi-square test of difference between number of Group A and Group B librarians who used more than or fewer than the mean number of selection aids used by all 20 librarians.

Expected frequencies were then calculated. These are the frequencies which would be expected if there were no differences in populations; for example, if the same proportion of Group A and Group B librarians used more than or fewer than the mean number of selection aids. Since the proportion of all 20 librarians who used more than the mean number of aids was 9/20 or .45, we would expect this same proportion among both Group A and Group B librarians if the two groups did not differ. The expected frequency of Group A librarians who used more than the mean number of aids was obtained by multiplying .45 by the total number of Group A librarians; the expected frequency obtained was 4.5. Expected frequencies for the other cells were obtained in a similar manner. Problems involving only one degree of freedom require a correction for continuity; therefore the difference between expected and observed values was reduced by .5. A four-cell contingency table has only one degree of freedom because, after the frequency in one cell is known, the other three frequencies are determined or are not free to vary.

The computation for the chi-square is shown in Table 4. A chi-square of .80 was obtained, and a level of significance of .05 was accepted. Using that level indicates that a difference as large as the obtained difference would be due to chance in only five cases out of 100 tries. The chi-square of .80 was then compared with the table on the distribution of the chi-square. It was not significant, however, since

TABLE 4

CHI-SQUARE COMPUTATION

Cell	f_o	f_e	f_o-f_e	$(f_o-f_e)^2$	$(f_o-f_e)^2/fe$
a	5.5	4.5	1	1	.22
b	3.5	4.5	-1	1	.22
c	4.5	5.5	-1	1	.18
d	6.5	5.5	1	1	.18
					x^2 = .80

the table indicates that a chi-square of 3.841 would be required for significance, and the obtained number was smaller than that.

Table 5 lists the 42 different selection aids used by any of the librarians and gives the number of librarians in each group who used each one. After figures for local newspapers had been subtracted from the total (except Chicago, London, and New York newspapers), the total for Group A was 171 and for Group B, 133. A chi-square was calculated in order to determine whether the total number of aids used by Group A librarians was significantly greater than the number used by Group B librarians. The chi-square obtained was 8.0, a figure significant at the .01 level. This result indicates the probability that in only one case out of 100 would such a large difference be due to chance.

TABLE 5

NUMBER OF LIBRARIANS IN GROUP A AND GROUP B WHO REPORTED USE OF EACH OF 42 BOOK SELECTION AIDS

	Number of Librarians Who Reported Use	
Selection Aid	Group A	Group B
American Book Publishing Record	6	4
Atlantic	0	3
Booklist and Subscription Books Bulletin	10	10
Book Buyers Guide	7	2
Book Review Digest	8	7
Book Review Index	0	1

TABLE 5 (contd.)

Selection Aid	Number of Librarians Who Reported Use	
	Group A	Group B
Books in Print	7	6
Chicago Tribune Magazine of Books	10	8
Chicago Daily News	1	2
Chicago Sun-Times	3	2
Cumulative Book Index	8	4
Doubleday Catalog	2	2
Fiction Catalog	10	9
Harpers	0	3
Indianapolis Star	2	2
Keokuk Gate City	1	0
Library Journal	10	9
McClurg's Book News	2	2
New York Herald Tribune. Book Week	6	2
New York Times Book Review	9	5
New Yorker	0	1
New York Review of Books	3	1
Newsweek	1	3
Paperbound Books in Print	5	4
Park Forest Star	1	0
Peoria Journal Star	0	1
Publishers Trade List Annual	3	1
Publishers Weekly	5	5
Reader's Adviser and Bookman's Manual	6	4
Saturday Review	10	9
Science Newsletter	2	0
Scientific American	1	0
St. Louis Globe	0	1
St. Louis Post-Dispatch	1	1
Standard Catalog for High School Libraries	6	2
Standard Catalog for Public Libraries	9	9

TABLE 5 (contd.)

Selection Aid	Number of Librarians Who Reported Use	
	Group A	Group B
Subject Guide to Books in Print	8	5
Time	5	3
Times of London Literary Supplement	1	0
Virginia Kirkus	6	3
Waukegan News-Sun	0	2
Wilson Library Bulletin	1	2
Total Aids Used	176	140
Mean Number Used by Each Librarian	17.6	14.0

Relationship Between Number of Aids Used and Years of Library Experience

The number of selection aids used might be related more strongly to library experience than to library education. The following hypothesis could be used to test that idea:

> The greater the number of years of library experience a librarian has the greater the number of selection aids he will use, other things being equal, because librarians become acquainted with more and more aids as their experience increases.

The following procedures were used to find out whether this hypothesis was more tenable than the previous hypothesis tested which related the number of aids used to professional education. The number of aids used by librarians with more than the mean number of years of library experience of all 20 librarians (22.05 years) was compared with the number of aids used by those with less than the mean.

There was very little difference between these two groups of librarians, the average for each group being 15.2. Four of the librarians who had more than 22.05 years of experience used more than the mean number of aids and five used fewer than that number. Of those who had fewer than 22.05 years of experience, five used more than the mean number of aids and six used fewer than that number. Since the difference between the groups is so small, this analysis does not support the contention that more experienced librarians use more selection aids than the less experienced. As is shown in the preceding pages, a stronger relationship was found between number of aids used and library education.

Cause of the Difference Between the Two Groups of Librarians

An attempt was made to study the element given as the probable cause that degree librarians use more selection aids than other librarians; namely, that the former are systematically exposed to aids in library school courses. It was reasoned that if library school education was the cause of the use of a greater number of selection aids by Group A than Group B librarians, the majority of Group A librarians would have learned about most of the aids which they used in library school courses. All the interviewees were asked where they had first become acquainted with the majority of aids which they used. Seven of the Group A librarians replied that they had first learned about most of those which they used in library school classes. One replied that she had obtained this information in a three-year apprenticeship in a college library which had taken place before she enrolled in library school. Another librarian stated that she had become acquainted with about half of the aids in library school and about half from work experience. The tenth librarian replied that she had learned about most of the aids which she used during library work experience since she had forgotten about book selection aids between library school graduation and taking her first job as a book selector. She had been a housewife for some 20 years in the interim.

Almost all of the Group B librarians had become acquainted with most of the selection aids which they used through library work experience. Five of them indicated that they had had no experience in book selection work before taking their present positions and had no prior knowledge of book selection tools; therefore, they simply used those aids which had been used by the previous librarian. One reported that her first library job was in a very small library; she had no knowledge of how to go about selecting books, so she visited a nearby college library and secured advice on which aids to use from the college librarian. Another Group B librarian reported that she had learned about most of the selection aids which she used during a summer school course in library science. Another indicated that she had learned about most of the selection aids which she used by talking with other librarians at various professional meetings.

The fact that most of the Group A librarians had become acquainted with most of the selection aids they used in library school while most Group B librarians had learned about them from work experience and that the former group used more aids than the latter group would seem to lend some support to the claim that exposure to aids in library school results in the use of a larger number of aids by Group A than by Group B librarians.

Types of Selection Aids Used

Another way of evaluating a book selector is on the basis of the kinds of publications he uses in book selection. Local newspapers, general magazines, professional library reviewing media, and other types of publications might be used by librarians in deciding which books to purchase. It was assumed that it is more desirable to use aids which are prepared especially for libraries or bookstores than aids prepared for the general public. Since the purpose of this study was to test the proposition that library school graduates are better book selectors than librarians with little or no library school education, it was hypothesized that the former group would use and would prefer library-directed aids to a greater extent than the latter group.

The 42 selection aids were divided into two groups, those which were judged to be directed mainly at librarians or booksellers and those directed mainly at other audiences. Table 6 contains figures on the number of librarians in each group who reported use of the library-directed aids. Table 7 contains figures on the number of librarians who used the other selection aids, those directed principally at other audiences.

There was little difference between Groups A and B, although Group A librarians preferred a slightly larger proportion of library-directed aids. Of the 176 aids mentioned by Group A librarians, 119 (67.9 percent) are library directed. Of the 140 aids mentioned by Group B librarians, 91 (65.0 percent) are library-directed.

A chi-square test was done in order fo find out whether the difference in the total number of library-directed aids and non-library-directed aids used by Group A librarians and by Group B librarians was greater than could be accounted for by chance alone. The chi-square obtained was only .14, a small number which is not significant; therefore, there was a strong probability that the difference between the two groups was due to chance.

TABLE 6

NUMBER OF GROUP A AND GROUP B LIBRARIANS WHO REPORTED USE OF LIBRARY-DIRECTED AIDS

Selection Aids	Number of Librarians Group A	Group B
American Book Publishing Record	6	4
Booklist and Subscription Books Bulletin	10	10
Book Buyers Guide	7	2
Book Review Index	0	1
Books in Print	7	6
Book Review Digest	8	7
Cumulative Book Index	8	4
Doubleday Catalog	2	2
Fiction Catalog	10	9
Library Journal	10	9
McClurg's Book News	2	2
Paperbound Books in Print	5	4
Publishers Weekly	5	5
Publishers Trade List Annual	3	1
Readers Adviser and Bookman's Manual	6	4
Standard Catalog for High School Libraries	6	2
Standard Catalog for Public Libraries	9	9
Subject Guide to Books in Print	8	5
Virginia Kirkus	6	3
Wilson Library Bulletin	1	2
Total	119	91

TABLE 7

NUMBER OF GROUP A AND GROUP B LIBRARIANS WHO REPORTED USE OF NON-LIBRARY-DIRECTED AIDS

Selection Aids	Number of Librarians Group A	 Group B
Atlantic	0	3
Chicago Tribune Magazine of Books	10	8
Chicago Daily News	1	2
Chicago Sun-Times	3	2
Harper's	0	3
Indianapolis Star	2	2
Keokuk Gate City	1	0
New York Herald Tribune. Book Week	6	2
New York Times Book Review	9	5
Newsweek	1	3
New Yorker	0	1
New York Review of Books	3	1
Park Forest Star	1	0
Peoria Journal Star	0	1
Saturday Review	10	9
Science Newsletter	2	0
Scientific American	1	0
St. Louis Globe	0	1
St. Louis Post-Dispatch	1	1
Time	5	3
Times of London Literary Supplement	1	0
Waukegan News-Sun	0	2
Total	57	49

Librarians were also asked to indicate which two selection aids they found most helpful in book selection. Their answers are listed in Table 8. There was very little difference between the two groups of librarians. Eighteen of the aids listed as most helpful by Group A librarians are library-directed aids and two are non-library-directed. Sixteen of those mentioned by Group B librarians fall into the former

TABLE 8

TWO SELECTION AIDS MENTIONED AS MOST HELPFUL BY EACH LIBRARIAN

Librarians	Selection Aids
GROUP A	
Librarian 1	Booklist, Library Journal
2	Booklist, Virginia Kirkus
3	Book Buyers Guide, Virginia Kirkus
4	Booklist, Book Buyers Guide
5	Booklist, Library Journal
6	Booklist, Library Journal
7	Booklist, Library Journal
8	Booklist, New York Times
9	Booklist, Saturday Review
10	Library Journal, Virginia Kirkus
GROUP B	
Librarian 11	Booklist, Publishers Weekly
12	Chicago Tribune, New York Times
13	Booklist, Book Buyers Guide
14	Booklist, Virginia Kirkus
15	Booklist, Library Journal
16	Booklist, Chicago Tribune
17	Booklist, Library Journal
18	Library Journal, Virginia Kirkus
19	Saturday Review, Virginia Kirkus
20	Library Journal, Publishers Weekly

category and four into the latter category. A chi-square test revealed that the difference between Group A and Group B librarians was not significant, the chi-square obtained being .20.

Purchasing Books Directly from Salesmen

It was reasoned that better book selectors would make purchases of general books from salesmen to a lesser extent than poorer selectors since librarians rarely have time to check reviews of books offered for sale but must rely on the salesmen's evaluation of books. Salesmen are in business to make a profit and cannot usually be expected to be as objective in their evaluation of books as, for example, book reviewers. On the other hand, the very best book selectors might occasionally buy special types of books from salesmen, such as reference books with which librarians are familiar or out-of-print books which are difficult to obtain through regular channels. It was hypothesized that library school graduates would make fewer purchases of general books from salesmen than librarians with little or no library school education. The hypothesis was tested by asking librarians whether they ever ordered or purchased books directly from salesmen who visited the library, and if they did, what types of books they purchased, from which salesmen they made purchases, and how often they did so.

Nine of the Group A librarians responded that they did sometimes order or purchase books from salesmen, and one reported that she never did so. All ten of Group B librarians responded in the affirmative. Therefore, on the surface, there seemed to be little difference between the two groups of librarians.

Answers to the query about regular purchases of general books from salesmen, however, revealed that Group A librarians relied much less on salesmen than Group B librarians. Only two Group A librarians indicated that there were salesmen from whom they made regular purchases of general books while seven Group B librarians reported such practices. Although the difference is substantial, it is not significant at the .05 level. A chi-square test was done to determine whether the number of Group B librarians who made regular purchases from salesmen was significantly greater than the number of Group A librarians who did so. A chi-square of 3.23 was obtained, which is significant only at the .10 level, not at the .05 level. Nonetheless, the difference is interesting and perhaps lends some support to the hypothesis.

Doubleday representatives were most often mentioned as the salesmen from whom librarians made regular purchases. Two Group A librarians regularly purchased books from Doubleday salesmen. Seven of the Group B librarians made regular purchases from their Doubleday representatives; two of these librarians also purchased regularly from McClurg salesmen and one from a Jean Kerr representative.

As mentioned above, only two Group A librarians purchased general books from salesmen, and one never purchased anything from them. Seven other Group A librarians reported that, while they occasionally purchased special types of things from salesmen such as reference books with which they were familiar, discounted remainders, or out-of-print books, they never purchased general materials. For example, one librarian mentioned atlases or Who's Who volumes as the type of things she might buy. Several indicated that they sometimes bought remainders because they could get them at such a good discount. In contrast to this occasional use of salesmen for only special types of materials among Group A librarians, it was common for Group B librarians to purchase general new books from salesmen. Seven reported that they did so regularly.

Although librarians were not specifically asked for their opinions of the reliability of salesmen, some of them offered comments which suggest that Group A librarians were more skeptical of the trustworthiness of salesmen than Group B librarians. Of the former group, two volunteered the opinion that book salesmen could not be relied on to give objective evaluations of books and therefore they made few purchases from them. On the other hand, three Group B librarians specifically mentioned that they placed considerable trust in the judgment of one or more book salesmen. Two of them reported that their salesman was most helpful in suggesting which books might be controversial and therefore should not be added to their libraries. It seems that those salesmen helped the librarians practice censorship.

Book Clubs and Rental Collections

It was reasoned that better book selectors would make less use of standing orders of books from book clubs or of rental collections from commercial lending agencies than poorer selectors because such services allow librarians to do little or no pre-selection and evaluation of books before they are sent to libraries. Book clubs often simply send a group of books without giving librarians much opportunity to select or reject them. Sometimes, librarians may return some of the books they do not want. Sometimes, they may do a limited amount of selection by choosing one book from every two or three offered. It was also reasoned that better book selectors would make less use of rental agencies which do not allow librarians to do much book selection.

It was hypothesized that librarians who had graduated from a library school program would make less use of such services than librarians with little or no library science education. To test this hypothesis, Group A and Group B librarians were asked whether they received books from book clubs or from commercial agencies, and if so, from which ones, and to what extent they selected books received from those agencies.

There was little difference between Group A and Group B librarians on the matter of book club subscriptions. Nine of the Group A librarians, and all ten of the Group B librarians reported that they subscribed to one or more book clubs. The average Group A library had subscriptions to 2.4 book clubs, and the average Group B library to 2.9. The number of libraries of each group which had subscriptions to various book clubs is shown in Table 9.

There was also little difference in the number of Group A and Group B libraries which received collections from commercial lending libraries. Four of the Group A libraries and five of the Group B libraries received such collections. Two Group A libraries received such collections from the American Lending Library, and two received them from the McNaughton Library. Three Group B libraries received collections from the American Lending Library and two received them from the McNaughton Library.

There was very little difference in the amount of selection done by Group A and Group B librarians who received books from commercial lending libraries. Three of the Group A librarians and three of the Group B librarians indicated that they did some selection themselves. This consisted of occasionally requesting specific titles. One Group A librarian and two Group B librarians indicated that they did extremely little or no selection themselves. Books in certain categories were simply selected and shipped by the lending agency.

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF GROUP A AND GROUP B LIBRARIES WHICH HAD SUBSCRIPTIONS TO VARIOUS BOOK CLUBS

Book Club	Number of Libraries Which Had Subscriptions Group A	Group B
Arcadia	1	3
Avalon	0	1
Adventure Club	0	1
Book of the Month Club	1	2
Christian Herald Club	0	1
Crime Club	9	7
Doubleday Westerns	3	5
Fireside Theater	1	1
Literary Guild	8	8
Religious Book Club	1	0
Total	24	29
Mean	2.4	2.9

Summary

It was discovered that the number of library school graduates who used more than the mean number of selection aids used by all 20 librarians was greater, but not significantly greater, than the number of non-graduates who did so. As a group, the graduates used a significantly greater total number of aids than the other librarians. The idea that years of library experience might be related to number of aids used was tested, but very little difference was found between librarians with more than the mean years of experience and those with fewer than the mean. There was a stronger relationship between aids used and library school education. Little difference was found between Group A and Group B librarians on the matter of preference for library-directed or non-library-directed aids. There was a tendency for Group B librarians to do more purchasing of general books from salesmen than Group A librarians. There was little difference between the two groups of librarians on the matter of subscriptions to book clubs or lending libraries.

In summary, it seems that while the graduate librarians were in some ways superior to the non-graduates, in other ways, the two groups actually differed very little.

Footnotes to Chapter III

[1] *The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information, 1966* (New York: R.R. Bowker Co., 1966), p. 57.

[2] Orrilla T. Blackshear, *Building and Maintaining the Small Library Collection* (Chicago: Public Library Association, a division of the American Library Association, 1963), pp. 3-4.

[3] Mary Duncan Carter and Wallace J. Bonk, *Building Library Collections*, 2d. ed. (New York and London: Scarecrow Press, 1964), pp. 60-65.

[4] Constance M. Winchell, *Guide to Reference Books* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1951), pp. 55-59.

[5] Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., *Social Statistics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), pp. 212-21.

CHAPTER IV

QUALITY OF GROUP A AND GROUP B BOOKS AS MEASURED BY BOOK REVIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Samples of the 1965 book purchases of each librarian were drawn from the records of each library, and current book reviewing media and retrospective catalogs were consulted in order to find out whether a greater proportion of books selected by library school graduates was recommended by the media than of those selected by the non-graduates. This procedure of comparing the number of recommendations was used because it was felt that one way of judging the effectiveness of a book selector is by determining the "quality" of the selections made by him--the term quality being used, for want of a better one, to describe the appropriateness of books for public library use as judged by reviewing media and catalogs of best books. It is assumed that the better a book's reception by the media and catalogs, the more appropriate it is for public libraries since evaluations made by these sources are usually the best evaluations available. Librarians can personally read and evaluate only a very small proportion of the books which they purchase; therefore, they must rely on the selection tools. Moreover, no one librarian who selects books in many different subject areas (and almost all librarians who select books in small public libraries do) can be an expert in more than a few of these areas; therefore, it would seem essential to rely on reviewing tools and catalogs since these are usually produced by experts in various fields.

Since the purpose of this study is to test the contention that, other things being equal, library school graduates are better book selectors than those with little or no library school training, it was hypothesized that a greater proportion of the books selected by the former group of librarians are recommended by book reviewing media and catalogs than of those selected by the latter group.

The hypothesis was tested by taking samples of books selected by Group A and Group B librarians and checking reviewing tools and catalogs in order to find out what proportion of books selected by each group was recommended by the tools. Selection aids consulted were Booklist and Subscription Books Bulletin, Fiction Catalog, Library Journal, New York Times Book Review, Saturday Review, Standard Catalog for High School Libraries, Standard Catalog for Public Libraries, and Virginia Kirkus.

The samples were drawn from the card catalog or shelf list of each library. In the first two libraries samples of 25 books were taken. Samples of 50 books were taken from each of the other 18 libraries. In the case of the former two samples, the number of recommended and non-recommended books was doubled in order to make them equivalent to the other 18 samples. Throughout this chapter the figures cited for number of books or reviews include the double weights for the two samples of 25.

It was intended to include only books which had been published during 1965, but on verifying titles, it was found that twelve of them were actually published in 1964. Some of these latter had a 1965 copyright date, and perhaps local catalogers had copied the wrong date or the investigator may have copied the wrong information from library records. These twelve books were retained in the samples, and both 1964 and 1965 reviewing media and catalogs were utilized in order to determine which ones had received favorable recommendations and which had received unfavorable or no recommendations.

The following procedures were used in locating reviews or recommendations of titles. First of all, bibliographic information for each book was noted on a separate 3 x 5 card, and a library identification mark was placed in the upper right hand corner. Then all the cards from all 20 libraries were filed together in one alphabetical file by author's last name. The titles were then verified in order to make certain the bibliographic information copied from the library records was correct. Most of the titles were located in the Cumulative Book Index. Those which were not found in CBI were found in the National Union Catalog. A small number of errors were found in the information which had been copied from the catalogs and shelf lists of the libraries visited, such as the few mistakes in publication date mentioned above, and a few errors in titles and authors' names. These errors were corrected in order to make searching for reviews and listings simpler and more accurate.

All the reviewing tools and catalogs mentioned above were searched in order to find out which titles were recommended. In the case of the following aids, the regular indexes published in them were used: Booklist and Subscription

Books Bulletin, Library Journal, and Virginia Kirkus. The author and title sections of the Fiction Catalog, the Standard Catalog for Public Libraries, and the Standard Catalog for High School Libraries were consulted. At the time this checking was done, the most current Standard Catalog for High School Libraries had just been published, but the most current editions of the other two Wilson catalogs had not been issued. Since they were not expected to be published for several months, the investigator wrote the H. W. Wilson Company and asked whether it would be possible to obtain a list of the books to be included in each of the two catalogs prior to their publication. A prompt reply was received from the company offering to send galley proofs of the catalogs.[1] The titles in the samples were checked against the galleys. In the case of the New York Times Book Review and the Saturday Review, the indexing service of the Gale Research Company was used. A letter was written to the editor of the Gale Company's Book Review Index to find out whether it indexed all the books reviewed in the two publications concerned. The editor replied that a complete indexing was done, including even brief descriptive notes on books contained in articles in those publications.[2] The Book Review Index does not cover 1964 publications; therefore, in order to determine whether the twelve books bearing 1964 publication dates had been reviewed in the New York Times Book Review or in Saturday Review, the investigator examined the Index to Book Reviews in the Humanities, the Book Review Digest, and the New York Times Index. The 1965 tools were also consulted in order to find out whether these 1964 books had been reviewed in the year following publication. The Book Review Index was also used to double check the original work done in examining the first six tools mentioned above. It seemed important to make a very careful search so that all the appropriate reviews would be located.

Each review was carefully read and evaluated. If a book received a generally favorable review, a plus (+) was placed on the appropriate 3 x 5 card after an abbreviation for the reviewing tool. If the review was unfavorable, or if it was a non-evaluative book note which simply described the material in the book without making an evaluation, a zero was placed after the abbreviation. If the book was listed in a Wilson catalog, it automatically received a plus since listing in any of the three Wilson catalogs constitutes a recommendation.

Books selected by Group A and Group B librarians were compared as follows. First of all, the two groups of books were compared in regard to the number of books in each group which were recommended or not recommended in each of the tools consulted. For example, the number of Group A and Group B books recommended or not recommended in Booklist and Subscription Books Bulletin was compared, and a chi-square test was done in order to determine the probability that the difference between the two groups was due to chance. The .05 level or beyond was accepted as significant. The same procedure was used for each of the tools.

Each book was also rated according to the total number of plus signs on the card; that is, the total number of favorable reviews or recommendations. Books were placed in the following four categories:

Category I	Books with five or more recommendations
Category II	Books with three or four recommendations
Category III	Books with one or two recommendations
Category IV	Books with no recommendations

The number of Group A and Group B books which fell into each category was calculated, and the difference between the two groups was tested by the chi-square method.

Table 10 shows the number and percent of Group A and Group B books which were or were not recommended in each of the selection aids consulted. A considerably larger proportion of Group A books than of Group B books were recommended in Booklist and Subscription Books Bulletin: 328 Group A books, 256 Group B books. The difference between the two groups was tested by the chi-square method, and a chi-square of 20.7 was obtained. The chi-square obtained is significant at the .001 level. The probability that the obtained difference was due to sampling error is only one out of a thousand.

There was also a large difference between Group A and Group B books when compared on the basis of Library Journal recommendations. A total of 308 Group A books and 214 Group B books received favorable reviews in Library Journal. A chi-square of 34.7 was obtained. This statistic is significant at the .001 level.

Only a relatively small proportion of both groups of books were recommended in the New York Times Book Review: 103 Group A books and 86 Group B books. The chi-square obtained, 1.7, is not significant at the .05 level; therefore, there is a strong probability that the difference between the two groups of books is due to chance.

TABLE 10

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF GROUP A AND GROUP B BOOKS RECOMMENDED OR NOT RECOMMENDED IN VARIOUS SELECTION AIDS

Selection Aid	Group A Books				Group B Books			
	Recommended		Not Recommended		Recommended		Not Recommended	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Booklist	328	65.6	172	34.4	256	51.2	244	48.8
Library Journal	308	61.6	192	38.4	214	42.8	286	57.2
New York Times Book Review	103	20.6	397	79.4	86	17.2	414	82.8
Saturday Review	65	13.0	435	87.0	70	14.0	430	86.0
Fiction Catalog or Standard Catalog for Public Libraries	151	30.2	349	69.8	129	25.8	371	74.2
Standard Catalog for High School Libraries	39	7.8	461	92.2	42	8.4	458	91.6
Virginia Kirkus	172	34.4	328	65.6	127	25.4	373	74.6

A slightly larger proportion of Group B books than of Group A books were favorably reviewed in Saturday Review. Seventy Group B books and 65 Group A books were recommended in that periodical. Since the difference between the two groups was very small, only one percent, the small chi-square of .2 was obtained. This statistic is not significant at the .05 level.

The Fiction Catalog and the Standard Catalog for Public Libraries were dealt with as a single tool since they complement each other. Both of these catalogs are made up of titles voted on by a group of librarians as the most useful books for libraries, the former catalog dealing exclusively with fiction, and the latter dealing only with non-fiction. Therefore, any given title could appear in only one of them. A larger proportion of Group A books than of Group B books were recommended in either the Fiction Catalog or the Standard Catalog for Public Libraries, 151 Group A books and 129 Group B books. The chi-square obtained, 2.2, was not significant at the .05 level, however.

Forty-two Group B books and 39 Group A books were recommended in the Standard Catalog for High School Libraries. The difference between the two groups was extremely small and was therefore not significant at the .05 level. The chi-square obtained was .05.

There was a substantial difference in the number of Group A and Group B books favorably reviewed in Virginia Kirkus. A total of 172 Group A books and 127 Group B books were recommended in Kirkus reviews. A chi-square of 9.2 was obtained. This statistic is significant at the .01 level.

Each book was then placed into one of four categories based on the total number of favorable reviews or recommendations it received in the reviewing media and catalogs consulted.[3] The number and percentage of Group A and Group B books which were placed into each category are shown in Table 11.

In general Group A books received a larger number of favorable reviews and recommendations than Group B books. For example, 45 Group A books received five or more favorable reviews or recommendations compared with 29 Group B books. On the other hand, 118 Group B books received no favorable reviews or recommendations compared with only 66 Group A books. A chi-square of 23.7 was obtained. This chi-square

TABLE 11

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF GROUP A AND GROUP B BOOKS CLASSIFIED BY TOTAL NUMBER OF FAVORABLE REVIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS RECEIVED

	Category I (Five or More Recommendations)		Category II (Three or Four Recommendations)		Category III (One or Two Recommendations)		Category IV (No Recommendations)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Group A	45	9.0	173	34.6	216	43.2	66	13.2
Group B	29	5.8	132	26.4	221	44.2	118	23.6

problem has three degrees of freedom, and the statistic obtained is significant at the .001 level. This level of significance indicates that there is a very small probability that the difference between the two groups was due to chance.

Test of Causal Element

A cause proposed for the difference between Group A and Group B books as far as recommendations are concerned was the use of a greater number of selection aids by Group A librarians. It was found that Group A librarians did actually use more of these aids than Group B librarians (see Chapter III). If this is a logical cause, it should hold true for librarians regardless of their library school education; therefore, the following two groups of librarians were studied--those who used more than the mean number of selection aids reported by all 20 librarians, and those who used fewer than the mean number reported. The mean was 15.2. Six Group A librarians and four Group B librarians reported that they used 16 or more aids; therefore, they were placed in Group I. Four Group A librarians and six Group B librarians used 15 or fewer aids; they were placed in Group II. The number of Group I and Group II books (those selected by Group I and Group II librarians respectively) which fell into four categories were calculated.[4] The results of this calculation are shown in Table 12. As expected, there was a tendency for books selected by Group I librarians to have received more favorable reviews than those selected by Group II librarians.

TABLE 12

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF GROUP I AND GROUP II BOOKS CLASSIFIED BY TOTAL NUMBER OF FAVORABLE REVIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS RECEIVED

	Category I (Five or More Recommendations)		Category II (Three or Four Recommendations)		Category III (One or Two Recommendations)		Category IV (No Recommendations)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Group I	33	6.6	163	32.6	237	47.4	67	13.4
Group II	41	8.2	142	28.4	200	40.0	117	23.4

For example, 39.2 percent of the books selected by Group I librarians received three or more favorable reviews. The same was true of only 36.6 percent of the books selected by Group II librarians. On the other hand only 13.4 percent of Group I books received no recommendations compared with 23.4 percent of Group II books. The chi-square obtained was 19.03. With three degrees of freedom, this chi-square is significant at the .001 level, suggesting only a very small probability that the difference between the groups was due to chance. This analysis seems to lend some support to the contention that the cause of selecting superior books is the use of a greater number of selection aids.

Summary

The hypothesis that a greater proportion of books selected by library school graduates are recommended by book reviewing media and catalogs than of those selected by librarians with little or no library school education, was, in general, supported by the data collected; thus the books selected by the former group of librarians were more appropriate for public libraries than those selected by the latter group, assuming that reviews and recommendations are a legitimate measure of appropriateness.

A substantially and significantly greater proportion of books selected by library school graduates than of those selected by the other librarians were recommended in Booklist and Subscription Books Bulletin, Library Journal, and Virginia

Kirkus. When the New York Times Book Review and the Fiction Catalog and Standard Catalog for Public Libraries were examined, it was found that a larger proportion of Group A than of Group B books were recommended, but the differences between the groups of books were not great and were not significant at the .05 level. Only in the Saturday Review and the Standard Catalog for High School Libraries were a larger number of Group B books than of Group A books recommended, and the differences between the two groups of books were small, and were not significant in either of these cases.

When all the books were classified by four categories according to the total number of positive reviews or recommendations received by each one, it was found that, in general, Group A books received more recommendations than Group B books and the differences between Group A and Group B books were significantly large.

The causal element--that more Group A books than Group B books are recommended because Group A librarians use more selection aids--was tested by comparing the number of favorable reviews and recommendations received by books selected by librarians who used more than the mean number of selection aids used by all 20 librarians with the number of recommendations received by books selected by librarians who used fewer than the mean. It was found that books selected by the former group tended to be considerably better reviewed than those selected by the latter group. This analysis would seem to give some support to the belief that the larger the number of selection aids used the larger the number of recommendations selected books receive. It also seems to support the contention that the former is a cause of the latter.

Footnotes to Chapter IV

[1] Letter from Edwin B. Colburn, Vice-President and Chief of Indexing Services, H. W. Wilson Company, Bronx, New York, February 28, 1966.

[2] Letter from Bruce A. Davis, Editor, Book Review Index, Gale Research Company, Detroit, Michigan, February 17, 1966.

[3] See p. 50.

[4] See p. 50.

CHAPTER V

SUBJECTS AND PUBLISHERS OF GROUP A AND GROUP B BOOKS

Group A and Group B books were analyzed in order to find out whether there were any differences between the two groups as far as balance of selection in various subject areas is concerned. It is recognized that public libraries must meet a great variety of reading interests; therefore, it would seem that a well-rounded collection is superior to one which has a large proportion of books in just a few subject categories. It would also seem necessary to have current publications in the many subject areas and continually to add books in each of these areas. The mere possession of older books in a given subject is not sufficient to satisfy the reading interests of public library patrons because those patrons are so often interested in the most recent material. Since the samples of books used here are samples of the selections of a fairly long period of time--at least six months--it seems logical to expect that the samples would contain a well-rounded group of books.

It was hypothesized that library school graduates select more "well-rounded" collections of books than librarians with little or no professional education. The following procedures were used to test the hypothesis. The classifications of most of the books were ascertained by consulting the 1965 annual edition of the Book Publishing Record. The National Union Catalog was consulted in order to find the classification of those few books which did not appear in BPR. The classification for each book was written on the appropriate 3 x 5 card containing the bibliographic information for each book. Then a count was made of the number of books in each sample and the total number in Group A and Group B which fell into the various subject categories.

One interesting result of this analysis is the large difference between the two groups of books on the basis of fiction and non-fiction. The number and percentage of fiction and non-fiction in each of the samples was calculated. Slightly more than half of Group B books were fiction while only 35.6 percent of Group A books were in that category. A chi-square test was done in order to determine whether the difference in the number of fiction and non-fiction books selected by Group A and Group B librarians was significant. A chi-square of 23.5, which is significant at the .001 level, was obtained. Of the ten Group B samples, six consisted of 50 percent or more fiction. Of the Group A samples, one was 50 percent fiction and another 52 percent fiction, but the remaining eight were mostly non-fiction. One cannot logically claim that Group A is a superior group of books because it contains more non-fiction titles than Group B. Non-fiction is not intrinsically superior to fiction, and there are books of varying levels of quality among both categories. However, the fact that Group B books were more than half fiction while only slightly more than a third of Group A books were fiction suggests that Group B selections were not as balanced as Group A selections since more than half of all the books in Group B belong to only one of a large number of subject categories.

All the books were then classified into 101 different subject categories. The classifications are the 100 subjects listed under the Second Summary of the Dewey Decimal System plus a separate category for fiction.

The number of books which belong in each of the 101 subject categories is shown in Table 13. The two samples of 25 books each--Libraries 11 and 17--were eliminated from this analysis since they would be expected to include books in fewer subject categories than the other larger samples. These two samples were both Group B samples. In order to make Group A and Group B books comparable, two Group A samples were eliminated at random. These were the samples from Libraries 4 and 6.

The number of subject categories represented in the selections of each librarian was calculated. The average Group A sample contained books in 20.5 of the 101 categories; the average Group B sample had books in 19.0 categories. There were one or more Group A books in 50 of the 101 categories and one or more Group B books in 51 of the categories. There were 257 non-fiction books in Group A and 201 in Group B; therefore, the average number of Group A books in each of 49 non-fiction categories was 5.2. The average number of Group B books in each of 50 non-fiction categories was 4.0. Therefore, the average non-fiction category was better represented among Group A than among Group B books. It seems that Group A librarians did a somewhat better job of balancing their selections than Group B librarians since they selected more books in most of the non-fiction categories and did not select so heavily in fiction.

TABLE 13

GROUP A AND GROUP B BOOKS CLASSIFIED INTO 101 SUBJECT CATEGORIES

Subject Classification	Group A Libraries									Group B Libraries								
	1	2	3	5	7	8	9	10	Total	12	13	14	15	16	18	19	20	Total
Fiction	25	8	24	23	22	19	12	10	143	30	28	29	16	19	27	21	29	199
000						1			1									0
010							1		1									0
020						1	2	1	4						1			1
030									0									0
040									0									0
050									0									0
060					1	1			2									0
070						1			1					1				1
080									0									0
090									0									0
100									0									0
110									0									0
120									0									0
130	3	2					2		7				1					1
140			1						1		1							1
150	1				1		1		3									0
160									0									0
170									0	1		1		1				3
180		1							1									0
190									0									0
200								1	1									0

TABLE 13 (contd.)

Subject Classification	Group A Libraries									Group B Libraries								
	1	2	3	5	7	8	9	10	Total	12	13	14	15	16	18	19	20	Total
210									0									0
220									0		1							1
230									0									0
240	1			1					2						2			2
250									0									0
260		3							3		1				1			2
270									0									0
280									0									0
290									0								1	1
300	1	2	1		1	1	2	1	9				3	1	1			5
310									0				1					1
320		4	1	2	1	2	3	3	16	1		2	1	1		3		8
330		1	1	1		3	1	2	9		1	1		1		1		4
340		2			1				3	1				1		1		3
350							1	1	2	1			1	1		1		4
360			1			1		1	3			1	1	1	1		1	5
370	1					1	1		3		1		1					2
380		1	1			1	1	1	5							1	1	2
390					1		1		2				2			1	1	4
400									0									0
410								1	1					1				1
420									0									0
430									0									0
440									0									0
450									0									0

TABLE 13 (contd.)

Subject Classification	Group A Libraries									Group B Libraries								
	1	2	3	5	7	8	9	10	Total	12	13	14	15	16	18	19	20	Total
460									0									0
470									0									0
480									0									0
490									0									0
500	1	2				2			5		1				2		1	4
510							1		1		1							1
520									0									0
530									0			1				1		2
540									0					1				1
550									0	1					1			2
560						1			1									0
570		1		1	1			2	5	1			1					2
580			1						1						1			1
590					1		1	1	3	1		1	1			1		4
600									0									0
610	3	2	1			1	1	4	12	2	2		1	1	2			8
620	2	1		3				2	8	1			1	1	1			4
630			1	1	1	1	1		5	1	1				1	1		4
640	2			2			1		5			1	1	1				3
650		1	1				2	1	5					1				1
660									0									0
670									0									0
680									0									0
690									0									0

TABLE 13 (contd.)

Subject Classification	Group A Libraries									Group B Libraries								
	1	2	3	5	7	8	9	10	Total	12	13	14	15	16	18	19	20	Total
700					1		2	1	4			1				1	1	3
710				1					1	1			1			1		3
720									0									0
730					1	1			2									0
740		1	2	1		1	1	1	7	1				1	1		2	5
750									0				1					1
760									0									0
770									0									0
780	1	1				1			3				2					2
790	1	5	1	1	2	2	2	2	16	1	2	2	4	2		1	2	14
800						1			1		1	1	1					3
810	1		2	3	2		1	3	12	2	1	1	2	3	2	2		13
820		5			1			2	8		1			1		2	1	5
830									0									0
840									0									0
850									0			1						1
860									0									0
870									0									0
880									0									0
890									0									0
900			1	1			1		3				1			1		2
910	4	3	5		5	2	1	1	21	2	2	2	5		3	3	3	20

TABLE 13 (contd.)

Subject Classification	Group A Libraries									Group B Libraries								
	1	2	3	5	7	8	9	10	Total	12	13	14	15	16	18	19	20	Total
920	1		4	4	6	4	3	3	25	1	1	3		3	3	2	3	16
930									0									0
940	1	3		1		1	1	2	9	1	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	12
950		1							1							1	1	2
960					1				1					1				1
970	1		1	4			3	3	12		2	1		3		1	2	9
980									0									0
990									0									0
Total									400									400

Publishers of Group A and Group B Books

The number of publishers of Group A and Group B books was compared. This was done because it was believed that the number of different publishers might be another measure of the "well-roundedness" of the selected books. Many publishers tend to specialize in certain subjects and to promote certain points of view; therefore, it would seem that a well-rounded collection would come from more publishers than a collection which was concentrated in fewer areas. This analysis includes the doubling of the number of publishers for the two samples of 25 books.

In Group A, one sample contained the publications of only 20 publishing houses. This was the low for that Group. The high was 35. The range for Group B was 13 to 28. The average Group A sample contained works published by 27.8 different publishing houses while the average for Group B was 22.9.

All the publishers of Group A and Group B books are shown in Table 14 and the number of Group A and Group B books published by each of them are entered in the appropriate columns. There was a tendency for both Group A and Group B librarians to purchase a rather large proportion of their books from a few publishers, and just a small number from many other publishers; however, Group B librarians seemed to rely somewhat more heavily on just a few publishers than Group A librarians.

TABLE 14

ALL PUBLISHERS OF GROUP A AND GROUP B BOOKS AND THE NUMBER OF BOOKS PUBLISHED BY EACH OF THEM

Publishers	Number of Group A Books	Number of Group B Books
Abingdon	1	0
American Heritage	3	0
American Library Association	2	0
American Radio Relay League	0	1
American Technical Society	1	0
Appleton	3	2
Arcadia	0	16

TABLE 14 (contd.)

Publishers	Number of Group A Books	Number of Group B Books
Atheneum	6	8
Audel	0	1
Barnes	1	0
Barrows	1	0
Basic	1	3
Beacon	0	3
Bobbs	4	2
Bowker	0	1
Bouregy	5	3
Chilton	4	6
Citadel	1	0
Collins	0	1
Coward-McCann	2	5
Criterion	1	0
Crown	6	1
Crowell	3	0
Curtis	0	1
Day	9	9
Dell	1	0
Dial	4	1
Dimension	1	0
Dodd	14	5
Doubleday	99	174
Duell	1	0
Dutton	9	6
Erdmans	1	0
Farrar	8	7
Follett	2	0
Frewin	1	0
Grossett	1	0
Greystone	0	1

TABLE 14 (contd.)

Publishers	Number of Group A Books	Number of Group B Books
Harper	29	20
Hastings	1	0
Harcourt	7	5
Harvard	1	0
Harvard Student Services	0	1
Hawthorn	2	1
Hearthside	1	0
Hill and Wang	0	2
Holt	12	6
Hodder	0	1
Houghton	12	11
Hutchinson	0	1
Indiana University	1	0
Knopf	10	11
Krause	1	0
Lippincott	13	9
Little	11	7
McGraw	11	8
McKay	9	3
Macmillan	30	15
Merdith	1	0
Messner	3	2
Mill	2	1
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	1	0
Morrow	11	15
National Association of Social Workers	0	2
Natural History Press	2	5
Naylor	1	0
Nelson	1	1
New American Library	2	4

TABLE 14 (contd.)

Publishers	Number of Group A Books	Number of Group B Books
Norton	6	2
Oblensky	0	1
Odyssey	1	1
Oxford	1	2
Pantheon	5	1
Pitman	2	0
Plays, Inc.	1	0
Popular Library	0	2
Praeger	1	1
Prentice-Hall	6	9
Putnam	18	12
Pyramid	0	1
Quadrangle	1	1
Rand McNally	1	0
Random House	14	16
Regnery	3	1
Reinhold	1	1
Revell	0	2
Saint Martins	2	0
Shooting Industry	1	0
Simon and Schuster	13	9
Scribner	4	8
Sloane	1	1
Stein and Day	1	1
Stirling	0	1
Time, Inc.	8	25
Trident	2	0
Tuttle	2	0
Twayne	1	1

TABLE 14 (contd.)

Publishers	Number of Group A Books	Number of Group B Books
Ungar	1	0
University of Illinois	1	0
University of Iowa	1	0
University of Michigan	1	0
University of Minnesota	1	0
University of Oklahoma	3	0
Van Nostrand	1	0
Viking	11	8
Walck	1	0
Walker	0	2
Washburn	1	1
Watts	1	0
Westminster	2	1
Wilson	4	0
World	2	0
Yale	2	1
Total	500	500

For example, a total of 174 Group B books were Doubleday publications. This compared with 99 of the Group A books. There were six other publishers from whom one or both groups of librarians purchased a sizable number of books. Total number of books purchased from them by both groups of librarians are as follows:

Publishers	Number of Group A Books	Number of Group B Books
Arcadia	0	16
Harper	29	20
Macmillan	30	15
Morrow	11	15
Putnam	18	12
Time, Inc.	8	25

The most extreme cases of imbalance in number of publishers occur in Group B samples. One of the Group B samples contained 34 books published by Doubleday and four published by Time, Inc., out of the total of 50. Two other Group B samples each had 29 Doubleday books out of 50. Among Group A samples, on the other hand, the most extreme case of imbalance occurred in a sample which had 16 Doubleday books.

Probably many of the large number of Doubleday books in Group B samples were acquired directly from salesmen. As was noted in Chapter III, seven Group B librarians stated that they made regular purchases from Doubleday representatives. Only two Group A librarians indicated that they made such purchases.

It would be difficult tc defend the claim that the publications of certain publishers are generally more appropriate for public libraries than those of certain other publishers. Examination of the data, however, reveals certain differences in types of publishers which are of interest. These differences are small; therefore, no attempt is made to claim that they signify a superiority of one group of books over the other. One of these differences is in the number of Arcadia books included in the two groups. Sixteen Group B books were published by Arcadia House, while none of Group A books was. Arcadia publishes light romances, mysteries, and westerns which are rarely or never reviewed. (None of the 16 Arcadia books included in Group B was reviewed in any of the eight tools consulted in the course of this study.) In view of the fact that they are not reviewed, it seems doubtful that public libraries should purchase many of them. On the other hand, the Group A samples contain a larger number of university press publications than Group B samples. The number of such books are as follows:

Press	Number of Group A Books	Number of Group B Books
Harvard	1	0
Indiana	1	0
Oxford	1	2
Illinois	1	0
Iowa	1	0
Michigan	1	0
Minnesota	1	0
Oklahoma	3	0
Yale	2	1
Total	12	3

The presence of more university press publications among Group A books than among Group B books is not necessarily a point in favor of Group A book selectors, but it may suggest that Group A librarians tend to purchase more of the serious non-fiction titles than Group B librarians since most university press publications are of this type; however, other publishers also publish serious non-fiction; therefore, it would not seem justifiable to place too much emphasis on observed difference.

Summary

It was found that the library school graduates selected somewhat more well-balanced collections than the untrained librarians. The average Group A sample contained books in 20.5 of 101 subject categories, and the average Group B sample contained books in 19.0 categories. Half of the selections of Group B librarians were in only one of 101 catagories--fiction. The same was true of only 35.6 percent of the books selected by Group A librarians. The average number of Group A books in each of the non-fiction categories represented was 5.2 compared with 4.0 for Group B. Thus the many non-fiction categories seemed to be somewhat neglected by Group B librarians. The average Group A sample contained books produced by 27.8 publishers compared with only 22.9 for Group B librarians.

CHAPTER VI

CONTROVERSIAL BOOKS SELECTED BY GROUP A AND GROUP B LIBRARIANS

The attitudes and behavior of library school graduates and non-graduates towards controversial books were compared in order to find out whether the former group were more favorably disposed towards such books than the latter group. Years of library experience, and the educational level of communities were also studied in order to find out whether they were related to attitudes or behavior toward controversial books.

The library profession has made a number of official statements which indicate that public libraries should not exclude books because they are controversial. Public Library Service[1] (the standards for public libraries adopted by the American Library Association), the Interim Standards for Small Public Libraries,[2] the Library Bill of Rights,[3] and The Freedom to Read[4] all contain strong anti-censorship statements.

Since the profession has taken a strong stand against censorship, we might conclude that, other things being equal, public library book selectors who have more favorable attitudes towards controversial materials are better book selectors than those who have less favorable attitudes, and those selectors who purchase more of the recommended controversial materials are better book selectors than those who purchase fewer. Since the purpose of this study was to discover whether library school graduates are better book selectors than librarians with little or no library school education, it was hypothesized that the former group of librarians would have more favorable attitudes towards controversial books and would purchase a greater number of such books than the latter group.

The following procedures were used to test the hypothesis. Interviewees were asked several questions about their attitudes towards books which are controversial because of religious or political ideas or because of frank treatment of sex. They were also asked whether such controversial books were kept on open or closed shelves in their libraries. In addition, a list of books which have been reported as controversial was constructed. Librarians were asked whether they approved or disapproved of each of these books being included in the collections of public libraries like their own, and the holdings of each library were checked against this list. The list was constructed by consulting all issues of the Newsletter of the Intellectual Freedom Committee of the American Library Association published from 1960 through 1964. A note was made of books published from 1960 through 1964 which were reported as having caused censorship problems in libraries or bookstores. The Newsletter was used because it contains the most complete reporting of censorship incidents. Only books which were published from 1960 through 1964 were noted because some of the librarians in the sample studied had not been employed in their present positions before 1960 and therefore might not be considered responsible for the presence or absence of older books in their collections. Not all of these problem books were placed on the final list which was used, but only those which had been well reviewed since those which had not received favorable reviews or recommendations might not be appropriate for public libraries, at least not as appropriate as the recommended books. Only those books which had received three or more favorable reviews or recommendations in the following tools were retained on the list: Booklist and Subscription Books Bulletin, Fiction Catalog, Library Journal, New York Times Book Review, Saturday Review, Standard Catalog for High School Libraries, Standard Catalog for Public Libraries, and Virginia Kirkus.

Admittedly, the list of controversial books used is not a perfect measuring instrument. For example, some books which were controversial in some of the communities visited might not have been mentioned in the Newsletter of the Intellectual Freedom Committee of the American Library Association; and conversely, some mentioned in the Newsletter may not have been controversial in some of the communities studied. Moreover, the amount of controversy over books undoubtedly differs from one community to another. Nonetheless, the instrument used would seem to have validity since it includes those books which were reported as controversial in the most complete reporting service available and are probably those most likely to cause problems in the average community. Moreover, most of the books received wide publicity and their controversiality was well known; therefore, the librarians studied were probably aware of the fact that they were "problem books" and could cause controversy in their respective communities.

Interviews

The first question asked was about books which are controversial for political or religious reasons. Librarians were asked whether they approved or disapproved of such books being purchased for public libraries similar to their own. After each respondent had replied, she was asked why she felt the way she did. The two groups differed very slightly in the number who expressed approval or disapproval of the purchase of such controversial materials. Eight of the Group A librarians indicated that they felt libraries should purchase books which are controversial because of religion or politics, and two stated that they felt libraries should not purchase them. Of Group B librarians, seven approved of the purchase of such materials and three did not.

Of the 15 librarians who replied affirmatively, most were quite vehement in their defense of intellectual freedom and of the library's responsibility to provide books of a controversial nature. One Group A librarian, for example, gave several examples of pressure which she had resisted. In one case, several local Mormons had requested that she remove certain books which were critical of Mormonism. In another case, a Catholic priest had objected to the presence of Mister Roberts in the collection.[5] In both instances the librarian had refused to remove the titles. She did, however, put several pro-Mormon books into the collection because she believed that public libraries should have materials on various sides of an issue. Another Group A librarian reported her efforts to combat the censorship proclivities of several library board members who were sympathetic to a right-wing organization. They requested the librarian to display conservative publications in a prominent separate display case, and they also requested that she remove certain publications which they considered pro-communist. The librarian did the former, but refused to do the latter since she believed that libraries should contain materials with various political ideas. Another Group A librarian indicated her support of intellectual freedom by stating that people have a right to read whatever they please. Another said people should have access to many points of view so that they can make up their own minds. Another stated that controversial books should be purchased, but that librarians should be careful not to "overbalance one side."

Group B librarians who favored the inclusion of controversial materials gave similar reasons. One stated that a public library should include such books because some taxpayers want to read them. Another stated that people should read on all sides of a question and then make up their own minds. She believed that the only way to fight an evil organization was to have materials both favorable and unfavorable to it.

One of the Group A librarians who opposed inclusion of books which were controversial for political or religious reasons gave as her reason the lack of funds. She felt that there were other types of books which were more in demand. She reasoned that since book budgets of small libraries are limited and since controversial materials are not much in demand, they should not be purchased. The other Group A librarian who was opposed to purchasing problem books would not state her reasons.

Two of the Group B librarians who answered negatively also gave budgetary limitations as justification of their attitude. One said she would put some of these materials into her collection if they were given to the library but would not spend public funds on them. The other stated that few of her patrons were interested in reading such books, and since her book budget was limited, she did not feel justified in purchasing them. The third Group B librarian who was opposed to purchasing materials which might be controversial because of politics or religion argued that a library should purchase only those which patrons requested.

Librarians were then asked whether they believed public libraries should purchase novels which deal frankly with sex, and why they felt as they did. The number who favored or who disapproved of the purchase of such books was the same in each group. Seven Group A and seven Group B librarians favored the purchase of frank novels and three Group A and three Group B librarians were opposed.

Of the seven Group A librarians who favored such purchases, several gave as their reason the fact that library patrons want such books, and they felt a responsibility to cater to reader demand. One, for example, reported that she personally did not care to read such novels, but many of her patrons did, and she felt a responsibility to satisfy their reading interests. Another Group A librarian favored the purchase of frank novels because most modern fiction has a considerable amount of material on sex; therefore, she felt that if libraries want a good collection of new fiction, they must include some of the frank novels. Another librarian stated that novels such as Another Country are perfectly all right for adults. She said she was amazed that a twenty-six year old college student had been shocked by that book when required to read it as a college assignment.[6]

Several Group B librarians also mentioned patron demand as the justification for purchasing frank novels. One mentioned that adults requested such books, and she felt adults have a right to read what they please.

One Group A librarian who believed that public libraries should purchase very few if any frank novels stated that she was opposed to having such books in libraries because young people might gain access to them. She had very few such books in her library, and she did not put any of them on the library's bookmobile because it was used a great deal by young people. Another felt that public libraries should not purchase such books because she felt they are a waste of tax money and are easily and cheaply available in paperback for readers who want to buy them for themselves.

Of the three Group B librarians who were opposed to the inclusion of such books, two stated that their readers were not interested in such materials and they therefore did not buy them. One reported that small town people are not interested in novels with frank details of sex. (It is interesting that a variation of the same reason was used to support opposite positions. Some of the librarians who favored the inclusion of frank novels stated patron demand as their reason, and some who were opposed to the inclusion of such books stated lack of patron demand as their reason.) Another Group B librarian stated that she would not purchase such materials because she feared young people would read them. She would rent some of these novels from a rental library if requested to do so by patrons, but she would not purchase them for the library's permanent collection.

Librarians were asked whether problem books were kept on open or closed shelves, and responses indicate little difference between Group A and Group B libraries. Most of the libraries had a small number of controversial books on a restricted shelf. In none of the libraries visited did the number of such books exceed one shelf. All of the Group A libraries and eight of the Group B libraries had a few books on a restricted shelf, and two of the Group B libraries had no restricted shelf. Typically, the closed shelves contained a few books on sex education and marriage and one or two frank novels. Some of the libraries also included a few books on motor repair, cooking, or other subjects because these books were often stolen from the open shelves.

List of Controversial Books

All 1960 through 1964 issues of the Newsletter of the Intellectual Freedom Committee of the American Library Association were inspected, and the following 51 books published from 1960 through 1964 were mentioned as having caused censorship problems:

Anthony, Rey, pseud. The Housewife's Handbook of Selective Promiscuity. Documentary Books, 1962.

Baldwin, James. Another Country. Dial Press, 1962.

Blatty, William P. John Goldfarb, Please Come Home! Doubleday, 1963.

Brantley, Russell. The Education of Jonathan Beam. Macmillan, 1962.

Burroughs, William S. Naked Lunch. Grove, 1962.

Chessman, Caryl. Beyond a Reasonable Doubt. Morrow, 1961.

Cleland, John. Fanny Hill: Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure. Putnam, 1963.

Cousins, Norman. In Place of Folly. Harper, 1961.

Dean, Vera. Builders of Emerging Nations. Holt, 1961.

Durrell, Lawrence. Black Book. Dutton, 1960.

Genet, Jean. The Thief's Journal. Grove, 1964.

Goldman, William. Boys and Girls Together. Atheneum, 1964.

Goodman, Paul. Growing Up Absurd. Random House, 1960.

Gover, Robert. One Hundred Dollar Misunderstanding. Grove, 1962.

Haley, James Evetts. A Texan Looks at Lyndon. Palo Duro Press, 1964.

Heller, Joseph. Catch-22. Simon & Schuster, 1961.

Iannuzzi, J. Nicholas. What's Happening? A. S. Barnes, 1963.

Ihara, Saikaku. The Life of an Amorous Man. Tuttle, 1964.

Jameson, Storm. A Month Soon Goes. Harper, 1963.

Kantor, MacKinlay. Spirit Lake. World, 1961.

Kazantzakis, Nikos. Last Temptation of Christ. Simon & Schuster, 1960.

Lawrence, D. H. Lady Chatterley's Lover. Heinemann, 1963.

Lee, Harper. To Kill a Mockingbird. Lippincott, 1960.

Leonard, John. The Naked Martini. Dial Press, 1964.

Lewis, Oscar. The Children of Sanchez. Vantage, 1963.

McCarthy, Mary. The Group. Harcourt, 1963.

McLoughlin, Emmett. American Culture and Catholic Schools. Stuart, 1960.

McLoughlin, Emmett. Crime and Immorality in the Catholic Church. Stuart, 1962.

Meister, Robert, ed. A Literary Guide to Seduction [by] Ovid [and others]. Stein and Day, 1963.

Melman, Seymour. The Peace Race. Braziller, 1962.

Miller, Henry. Tropic of Cancer. Grove, 1961.

Miller, Henry. Tropic of Capricorn. Grove, 1962.

Miller, Henry. Plexus. Weidenfeld, 1963.

Osgood, Robert E. NATO: The Entangling Alliance. University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Putnam, Carleton. Race and Reason: A Yankee View. Public Affairs Press, 1961.

Rechy, John. City of Night. Grove, 1963.

Rochefort, Christiane. Children of Heaven. McKay, 1962.

Rubin, Harold. The Carpetbaggers by Harold Robbins [pseud.] Simon & Schuster, 1961.

Sade, Donatien Alphonse Francois comte, called Marquis de. Justine; Or, The Misfortunes of Virtue. Neville Spearman, Ltd., 1964.

Southern, Terry, and Hoffenberg, Mason. Candy. Putnam, 1964.

Storey, David. Radcliffe. Coward-McCann, 1964.

Trocchi, Alexander. Cain's Book. Grove, 1960.

Umar ibn Muhammad, al-Nefzawi. The Perfumed Garden of the Shaykh Nefzawi. Putnam, 1964.

Untermeyer, Louis, ed. An Uninhibited Treasury of Erotic Poetry. Dial, 1963.

Vatsyavana, called Mallanaga. The Kama Sutra; The Classic Hindu Treatise on Love and Social Conduct. Dutton, 1964.

Wallace, Irving. The Chapman Report. Simon & Schuster, 1960.

Warburg, James P. Disarmament: The Challenge of the Nineteen Sixties. Doubleday, 1961.

Waterhouse, Keith. Jubb. Putnam, 1964.

Wentworth, Harold, and Flexner, S. D., eds. Dictionary of American Slang. Crowell, 1960.

Weyl, Nathaniel. Red Star Over Cuba; The Russian Assault on the Western Hemisphere. Devin-Adair, 1960.

Wise, David, and Ross, T. B. The Invisible Government. Random House, 1964.

These 51 titles were checked against the reviewing tools and catalogs listed on page 72, and it was found that 14 of them had three or more favorable reviews or recommendations. These are listed in Table 15.

TABLE 15

CONTROVERSIAL BOOKS AND THREE SOURCES
WHICH RECOMMENDED EACH OF THEM

Books	Sources*
Baldwin. Another Country	FC, K, LJ
Brantley. The Education of Jonathan Beam.	BK, FC, K
Cousins. In Place of Folly.	BK, LJ, SR
Dean. Builders of Emerging Nations.	BK, K, LJ
Heller. Catch-22.	FC, K, NYT
Kantor. Spirit Lake.	BK, FC, LJ
Kazantzakis. Last Temptation of Christ.	BK, K, LJ
Lee. To Kill a Mockingbird.	BK, K, LJ
Lewis. Children of Sanchez.	BK, LJ, SR
McCarthy. The Group.	BK, FC, SR
Melman. The Peace Race.	BK, LJ, SR
Rochefort. Children of Heaven.	K, LJ, SR
Wentworth. Dictionary of American Slang.	LJ, NYT, SCPL
Wise. The Invisible Government.	BK, LJ, NYT

*Sources

BK	Booklist	LJ	Library Journal
FC	Fiction Catalog	SR	Saturday Review
K	Virginia Kirkus		
SCPL	Standard Catalog for Public Libraries		
NYT	New York Times Book Review		

Approval-Disapproval of the Controversial Books

In order to measure librarians' approval or disapproval of the controversial books on the list it was first necessary to record how many of the books librarians were acquainted with. Table 16 contains the number of respondents who were familiar or not familiar with each of the books.

TABLE 16

NUMBER OF GROUP A AND GROUP B LIBRARIANS WHO WERE ACQUAINTED WITH EACH OF THE FOURTEEN CONTROVERSIAL BOOKS

Books	Number of Group A Librarians	Number of Group B Librarians
Baldwin. Another Country.	8	10
Brantley. The Education of Jonathan Beam.	1	1
Cousins. In Place of Folly.	8	4
Dean. Builders of Emerging Nations.	3	0
Heller. Catch-22.	8	7
Kantor. Spirit Lake.	10	9
Katzantzakis. Last Temptation of Christ.	8	5
Lee. To Kill a Mockingbird.	9	10
Lewis. Children of Sanchez.	7	5
McCarthy. The Group.	10	10
Melman. The Peace Race.	0	1
Rochefort. Children of Heaven.	2	0
Wentworth. Dictionary of American Slang.	7	5
Wise. The Invisible Government.	5	6
Total	86	73
Mean Per Librarian	8.6	7.3

Librarians' familiarity with controversial books might in itself be a measure of their competence as book selectors. Examination of the table, however, makes it clear that the differences between the two groups of librarians are small, although Group A librarians were, on the average, familiar with a slightly larger number of the books than Group B librarians, the average for the former group being 8.6 and for the latter 7.3.

After librarians had indicated the books with which they were familiar, they were asked whether they approved or disapproved of each of those with which they were familiar for inclusion in the collections of small public libraries. Results of this inquiry are shown in Table 17.

On this test, Group B librarians did just slightly better than Group A librarians. The former group registered 66 approvals and seven disapprovals; the latter group registered 77 approvals and nine disapprovals. The percentage of disapprovals given by Group B librarians was 9.6 of the total of 73, and disapprovals constitute 10.5 percent of the responses given by Group A librarians. The differences are much too small to draw conclusions favoring either group, but it is clear that this test does not lend support to the hypothesis that librarians with library school education tend to have more favorable attitudes towards controversial books.

Behavior Regarding Controversial Books

In addition to testing attitudes towards controversial books the following test of behavior was made. The list of 14 books was checked against the holdings of each of the libraries in order to find out whether Group A librarians had selected a greater proportion of them than Group B librarians.

The number of the books held by each library ranged from three to eleven for Group A libraries and from two to eleven for Group B libraries. The average for Group A was 6.9 and for Group B, 5.4. Since the difference is rather small, the data do not support the hypothesis that library school graduates tend to select a greater number of controversial books than librarians with little or no library school education.

It seems surprising that the average library did not have more of the controversial books since the majority of the librarians in both groups seemed to be favorably disposed towards such books, and the majority of the books are very well known and probably in demand. Actually, there seems to be a definite discrepancy between librarians' expressed attitudes towards controversial materials and their behavior

TABLE 17

NUMBER OF LIBRARIANS WHO APPROVED OR DISAPPROVED OF CONTROVERSIAL BOOKS WITH WHICH THEY WERE FAMILIAR

	GROUP A			GROUP B		
Books	Number Familiar With Books	Number Who Approved of Books	Number Who Disapproved of Books	Number Familiar With Books	Number Who Approved of Books	Number Who Disapproved of Books
Baldwin. Another Country.	8	6	2	10	7	3
Brantley. The Education of Jonathan Beam.	1	1	0	1	1	0
Cousins. In Place of Folly.	8	8	0	4	4	0
Dean. Builders of Emerging Nations.	3	3	0	0	0	0
Heller. Catch-22.	8	7	1	7	7	0
Kantor. Spirit Lake.	10	10	0	9	9	0
Kazantzakis. Last Temptation of Christ.	8	7	1	5	4	1
Lee. To Kill a Mockingbird.	9	9	0	10	10	0
Lewis. Children of Sanchez.	7	6	1	5	5	0
McCarthy. The Group.	10	7	3	10	7	3
Melman. The Peace Race.	0	0	0	1	1	0
Rochefort. Children of Heaven.	2	2	0	0	0	0
Wentworth. Dictionary of American Slang.	7	7	0	5	5	0
Wise. The Invisible Government.	5	4	1	6	6	0
Total	86	77	9	73	66	7
Mean Per Librarian	8.6	7.7	.9	7.3	6.6	.7

in purchasing or not purchasing them. In order to test this discrepancy further, a test was made of the relationship between librarians' expressed attitudes towards controversial materials, regardless of their library school education, and their behavior in purchasing or not purchasing them. A count was made of the number of the books purchased by those who indicated that they favored purchasing such materials and those who were opposed. All those librarians who had stated approval of both types of controversial materials, those controversial because of political or religious reasons, and those controversial because of frankness about sex, were placed in one group (Group I), and all those who had expressed disapproval of either or both types of materials were placed in Group II. On this basis, there were eleven librarians in Group I; six of these were library school graduates and five were not. There were nine librarians in Group II; four of these were library school graduates and five were not. Table 18 lists the holdings of both groups of libraries.

The libraries of those librarians who approved of controversial books had only a slightly larger proportion of the books than those of the librarians who disapproved of such books. The average Group I library held 6.7 of the books, while the average Group II library held 5.4.

It was felt also that years of library experience might be related to number of controversial books purchased. It might be expected that librarians with a number of years of experience, being more secure in their positions, would purchase more of such books than the other librarians. Actually, there was little difference between the two groups of librarians, the mean number of controversial books selected by those with more than the mean number of years of experience being 6.6 and the mean number selected by those with fewer than the mean number of years of experience being 5.8. The range was five to ten for the former group and two to eleven for the latter group.

Librarians with a library school degree were asked whether they felt their attitude towards controversial books had been influenced by their library school education. This was done in order to investigate the causal element which had been proposed for the hypotheses; namely, that library school faculty members emphasize the importance of avoiding censorship. Only four of the librarians reported that their library school teachers had done so. Four others indicated

TABLE 18

HOLDINGS OF CONTROVERSIAL BOOKS IN GROUP I LIBRARIES (THOSE WHOSE LIBRARIANS HAD EXPRESSED APPROVAL OF SUCH BOOKS) AND IN GROUP II LIBRARIES (THOSE WHOSE LIBRARIANS HAD EXPRESSED DISAPPROVAL)

	GROUP I LIBRARIES		GROUP II LIBRARIES	
Books	Number Which Had Book	Number Which Did Not Have	Number Which Had Book	Number Which Did Not Have
Baldwin. Another Country.	7	4	3	6
Brantley. The Education of Jonathan Beam.	2	9	1	8
Cousins. In Place of Folly.	5	6	5	4
Dean. Builders of Emerging Nations.	2	9	2	7
Heller. Catch-22.	6	5	3	6
Kantor. Spirit Lake.	10	1	7	2
Kazantzakis. Last Temptation of Christ.	7	4	2	7
Lee. To Kill A Mockingbird.	11	0	9	0
Lewis. Children of Sanchez.	7	4	5	4
McCarthy. The Group.	9	2	5	4
Melman. The Peace Race.	1	10	1	8
Rochefort. Children of Heaven.	0	11	0	9
Wentworth. Dictionary of American Slang.	3	8	2	7
Wise. The Invisible Government.	4	7	4	5
Total	74	80	49	77
Mean Per Library	6.7	7.3	5.4	8.6

that, as well as they could remember, there had been little or no discussion of controversial materials in library school. Two reported that faculty members had warned them to be careful not to purchase books which might cause problems. The justification given by both teachers was that library book funds are limited and that librarians should spend their money on materials which will not cause problems. In light of these responses, it is not too surprising that there were only small differences between Groups A and B on the number of controversial books selected and on the attitudes of the two groups towards such books.

Analysis was done in order to discover whether there were any differences between those four librarians who reported that faculty members had encouraged them to avoid censorship and all the other 16 librarians, those six graduates who stated that faculty members had not encouraged them to avoid censorship and those ten who had not been to library school. These two groups of librarians will be referred to as Group I and Group II respectively, and their libraries as Group I and Group II libraries. The number of libraries which had each of the controversial books is shown in Table 19.

Those libraries whose librarians were encouraged to avoid censorship in library school held a larger proportion of the problem books than those whose librarians had not been so encouraged. The difference in this case was greater than the difference between all the library school graduates and all the non-graduates. The average number of the controversial books held by Group I libraries was 8.0 and by Group II libraries 5.69. A chi-square of 4.3, which is significant at the .05 level, was obtained on the difference between total books held or not held by Group I or Group II libraries.

The two groups of librarians were also compared on their approval or disapproval of the books with which they were familiar. All the Group I librarians approved of all those with which they were familiar while some of the Group II librarians disapproved of some of them. The average Group I librarian was familiar with 9.8 of the books and approved of the same number. The average Group II librarian was familiar with 7.5 and approved of 6.5. The difference between these two groups of librarians was greater than the difference found between Group A and Group B librarians.

TABLE 19

NUMBER OF GROUP I AND GROUP II LIBRARIES WHICH HELD CONTROVERSIAL BOOKS

	Group I Libraries		Group II Libraries	
Books	Number Which Had Book	Number Which Did Not Have	Number Which Had Book	Number Which Did Not Have
Baldwin. Another Country.	3	1	7	9
Brantley. The Education of Jonathan Beam.	2	2	1	15
Cousins. In Place of Folly.	3	1	7	9
Dean. Builders of Emerging Nations.	1	3	3	13
Heller. Catch-22.	2	2	7	9
Kantor. Spirit Lake.	3	1	14	2
Kazantzakis. Last Temptation of Christ.	2	2	7	9
Lee. To Kill a Mockingbird.	4	0	16	0
Lewis. Children of Sanchez.	3	1	9	7
McCarthy. The Group.	4	0	10	6
Melman. The Peace Race.	0	4	2	14
Rochefort. Children of Heaven.	0	4	0	16
Wentworth. Dictionary of American Slang.	2	2	3	13
Wise. The Invisible Government.	3	1	5	11
Total	32	24	91	133
Mean Per Library	8.0	6.0	5.69	8.31

Educational Level of Community

It was felt that librarians working in communities of a higher educational level might tend to purchase more controversial books than those working in communities of a lower educational level because people with considerable education would be expected to be more receptive to controversial books and ideas than those with less education. Perhaps librarians would be influenced by their communities to such an extent that library school education or lack of it might make little difference.

The average educational attainment of persons of 25 years and over in all 20 communities was 11.9. The number of controversial books held by all those libraries located in communities which had an average educational attainment above 11.9 was compared with the holdings of all those libraries located in the communities below 11.9. Six Group A libraries and five Group B libraries were in the former group, and four Group A libraries and five Group B libraries were in the latter group. The average number of controversial books held by libraries located in the high-educational-level communities was 6.6; and the average for the other libraries was 5.0. Therefore, it seemed that educational level of community had some, but not a great effect on the number of controversial books purchased. The average difference between these two groups (1.6) was approximately the same as the average difference between Group A and Group B libraries (1.5).

Summary

The hypotheses that librarians who had graduated from a library school would have more favorable attitudes towards controversial books and would purchase a greater number of such books than librarians with little or no library science education did not receive much support from the data collected. Very small differences were found between Group A and Group B librarians when asked whether they approved of the purchase of controversial materials for public library collections. When asked whether they approved or disapproved of the purchase of particular books which have been reported as controversial, the differences between Group A and Group B librarians were also small, with Group B librarians registering a slightly smaller proportion of disapprovals than Group A librarians. The collections of each library were checked against a list of problem books, and it was found that the average Group A library had more of the books than the average Group B library, 6.9 compared with 5.4.

These findings are different from those of Marjorie Fiske who discovered that librarians with professional training tended to have considerably more liberal attitudes towards controversial materials than librarians without such professional training. It is possible that the difference in the findings of the two studies is due to the difference in the general education of the non-professional librarians interviewed in the two studies. Fiske interviewed a number of librarians who had very little or no college training while all the interviewees in this present study had considerable college education.[7] It may be that college education has a liberalizing effect on students. It may also be that the untrained librarians interviewed in this present study are somewhat more liberal than those interviewed by Fiske because the present period is less tense regarding controversial materials than the 1950's when Fiske did her study. Moreover, Midwestern librarians in general may be somewhat more liberal than California librarians because the Midwestern climate may be less pro-censorship than the California climate.

A test was made of librarians' expressed attitudes towards controversial materials, regardless of their professional training, and their behavior in purchasing or not purchasing such materials. It was found that those librarians who expressed approval of such books tended to purchase more of them than those who expressed disapproval, but the difference between the two groups was small. Therefore, it seems that there was a definite discrepancy between what librarians said about problem books and what they actually did about them. Those who claimed to be liberal did not purchase a much greater number of them than those who expressed more conservative attitudes.

Only four of the ten library school graduates reported that library school faculty members had encouraged them to avoid censorship. It was found that those four librarians had purchased a larger number of the problem books than the remaining sixteen librarians, the average for the former group being 8.0, and for the latter group, 5.69. The former librarians also expressed approval of a larger proportion of the books than the latter. The difference between these two groups was greater than the difference between all the graduates and all the non-graduates. This evidence may indicate that encouragement of liberal attitudes and behavior in library school does have the desired effect on book selectors; however, it is also possible that some other cause was operating.

Footnotes to Chapter VI

[1] Public Library Service: A Guide to Evaluation with Minimum Standards, Prepared by Co-ordinating Committee on Revision of Public Library Standards, Public Libraries Division, American Library Association (Chicago: American Library Association, 1956), p. 33.

[2] Interim Standards for Small Public Libraries: Guidelines toward Achieving the Goals of Public Library Service (Chicago: Public Library Association, a Division of the American Library Association, 1963), p. 7.

[3] Library Bill of Rights, Adopted by the Council of the American Library Association at Atlantic City on June 18, 1948.

[4] The Freedom to Read: A Statement Prepared by the Westchester Conference of the American Library Association and the American Book Publishers Council May 2 and 3, 1953, p. 4.

[5] Thomas Heggen, Mister Roberts (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1946).

[6] She was referring to a father's protesting the fact that his twenty-six year old daughter was required to read James Baldwin's Another Country as an assignment in an American literature course at Wright Junior College in Chicago. This led to a controversy over academic freedom. See Ralph E. McCoy, "The ABC's of Illinois Censorship, 1965," Illinois Libraries, XLVIII (May, 1966), 374-76.

[7] Marjorie Fiske, Book Selection and Censorship (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959), p. 120.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

One of the assumptions on which education is based is that formal instruction leads to improvement in attitudes and behavior, improvements which would not be as likely to take place otherwise. An example of this is the belief that formal library science education produces librarians who are superior to those who have not had the benefit of such professional education if other things such as general education and amount of library work experience are equal. Previous research in various fields indicates that a small or moderate relationship between formal education and competence can be measured, but most studies suggest that this is not a strong relationship. This present study had similar results. Only a moderate relationship, but apparently a real one, was found between library science education and performance in book selection; therefore, the assumption that library school education leads to superior performance in libraries was only partially confirmed. A number of possible explanations of the reasons that more positive results are not obtained in studies of this type are discussed below.

The major purpose of this study was to test the assumption that, other things being equal, library school graduates are better book selectors than librarians with little or no library science education, competence of librarians being judged by various accepted book selection principles and practices. The following are major findings:

> The number of graduates who used more than the mean number of aids used by all 20 librarians was greater, but not significantly greater, than the number of the non-graduates who did so.
>
> The library school graduates, as a group, used a significantly greater total number of book selection aids than the untrained librarians.
>
> The library school graduates used and preferred library-directed selection aids to a somewhat greater extent than the other librarians, but the differences between the two groups were small.

> Only two library school graduates made regular purchases of general books from salesmen while seven of the other librarians did so.
>
> Little difference was found between the two groups of librarians on the matter of subscriptions to book clubs and rental collections.
>
> Books selected by the library school graduates, in general, received more recommendations in book reviewing media and retrospective catalogs than those selected by the non-graduates, and the differences between the two groups of books are statistically significant.
>
> The library school graduates did somewhat better than the other librarians in making "well-rounded" selections. The graduates selected significantly more non-fiction books than the non-graduates. Since about half of the selections of the non-graduates were in only one category--fiction--compared with only 35.6 percent of the books selected by the graduates, it seemed that the many non-fiction areas were somewhat neglected in the selection of the former group of librarians. The non-fiction categories were, in general, better represented among Group A books than among Group B books.
>
> Books selected by Group A librarians were published by a considerably greater number of publishers than those selected by Group B librarians.
>
> There was little difference between the two groups of librarians in attitudes or behavior towards controversial books.

Alternative hypotheses were also investigated in order to determine whether competence in book selection was more strongly or less strongly related to certain factors other than library school education. If alternative factors were shown to be less strongly related than library school education to high performance, the case for arguing that professional education was a cause of greater competence would be strengthened. Such factors as sex, years of library experience, and educational level of the community might be more strongly or less strongly related to effectiveness in book selection than graduation from a library school. The effect of sex could not be analyzed in this study since it was necessarily confined to women librarians. The original questionnaire survey revealed that very few men librarians had major responsibility for book selection in the libraries surveyed; therefore only women librarians were studied. Findings related to the alternative possible causes of success are as follows:

> There was very little difference in the number of selection aids used by the more experienced librarians as compared with the number used by the less experienced librarians.
>
> There was little difference between the more experienced and the less experienced librarians as to the number of controversial books purchased.
>
> There was a small difference in the number of controversial books purchased by those librarians who worked in libraries located in communities which were above average in educational level for all twenty communities and those purchased by librarians who worked in libraries located in communities which were below average in educational level, the former group purchasing a somewhat larger number than the latter group.

The reasons that the graduates and the untrained librarians did not differ to a greater extent on number of selection aids used are not clear. It seems, however, that the untrained librarians had been able to find out about a substantial number of aids through informal means such as library work experience and conversations with other librarians, most of the untrained librarians interviewed reporting that they had become acquainted with aids by such informal methods.

The investigator had expected that, while the professionals relied heavily on standard library selection aids because they had learned about such aids in library school, the untrained would show a strong preference for general magazine and newspaper book sections because they had not been introduced to the standard aids. However, little difference was found between the two groups, It seems that Group B librarians were able to find out about standard selection aids through informal means. If untrained librarians with very little experience had been studied, it might have been found that they relied more heavily on non-library-directed aids than those interviewed for this study. It is also possible that since the untrained librarians studied were college educated, they were aware of the importance of using high-quality reviewing tools because of their college training in English or other subjects. If untrained librarians with only high school education had been studied, it might have been found that they relied more heavily on such sources as local newspapers and popular magazines.

As expected, only a few of the library school graduates made regular purchases of general books from salesmen while most of the non-graduates did so. This would seem to indicate that the former were more concerned with evaluating materials than the latter. In the matter of subscriptions to book clubs and rental agencies, however, little difference was found between the two groups of librarians. It is surprising that the differences between Group A and Group B librarians were not greater with regard to this point since subscription services do not generally allow much opportunity for evaluation of materials received. A possible explanation is that lack of time for evaluating books to purchase leads professional librarians to subscribe to commercial services which automatically send a certain number of books periodically.

Books selected by the library school graduates had, in general, received more recommendations than those selected by the other librarians. The large differences obtained had been expected since the library school graduates used more selection aids and therefore had access to more evaluations than the other librarians. The non-graduates, having fewer printed evaluations available, would probably purchase more books for which they found no reviews and in this process obtain more "inferior" books than the graduates. Another possible cause of the large differences between the two groups is that library school students are taught the importance of selecting only better materials for libraries. Untrained librarians, on the other hand, might be more influenced by salesmen who sell questionable materials, or by a small group of vocal readers who demand such materials.

The selections made by the library school graduates were more "well-rounded" than those made by the other librarians. This result had been expected since it was felt that the graduates would be more concerned with providing for the many actual and potential reading interests in their communities than would the untrained librarians.

There are several possible explanations of the reasons that there were only small differences between the two groups of librarians as far as their attitudes and behavior towards controversial books are concerned. Perhaps library school faculty members do not stress strongly enough the importance of including controversial materials in library collections. In fact, several librarians queried noted that library school professors had warned them not to purchase books which might cause problems. If library schools do not stress the importance of purchasing controversial materials, one probably would not expect the graduates of such schools to be more liberal than untrained librarians. It is also possible that a librarian's attitudes and behavior towards controversial books are influenced much more strongly by factors other than library school education, such as family and religious background and general education.

Destruction of alternative hypotheses is an accepted way of strengthening the proposed hypothesis. The fact that there was a weaker relationship between success in selection and alternative factors than was found between success and professional education would seem to strengthen the argument that competence is related to such education. It was found in this study that years of library experience and educational level of the community had little relationship to various measures of effective book selection. However, much more study of these alternative hypotheses is needed before final conclusions are made.

Several attempts were made to test directly the causal element of library school education. If library school education influenced Group A librarians to use more selection aids than Group B librarians, the former would have become acquainted in library school with most of the aids which they used while the latter would have become acquainted with most of those which they used by some informal means such as experience. When questioned about this matter, most Group A librarians reported that they had learned in library school courses about most of the aids which they used. Most of the non-graduates had become acquainted with the aids which they used in some informal manner such as experience.

A cause proposed for the higher quality of Group A than of Group B books was that Group A librarians used a greater number of selection aids and thus had more evaluations of books than did Group B librarians. Group A librarians did indeed use more aids, and this finding would seem to lend some plausibility to the causal element. This matter was also tested by comparing the number of recommendations received by those books selected by all those librarians who used more than the mean number of aids reported used by all 20 librarians with those received by books selected by all those librarians who used fewer than the mean number of aids. In this analysis, the professional education of the librarians was disregarded since the cause, if plausible, should hold true for both Group A and Group B librarians. It was found that those books selected by librarians who used more than the mean number of selection aids received significantly more recommendations than those selected by the other librarians.

Apparently, library school education had little effect on librarians' attitudes or behavior towards controversial books; such education did not seem to cause librarians to be more liberal in their selection activities. Perhaps the reason was that most of the graduates had not been encouraged, in library school, to avoid censorship. The four librarians who reported that they had been so encouraged, however, tended to be more favorable towards and to purchase more controversial books than the other librarians. If the findings of this study are typical, it would seem that library school study of censorship can cause librarians to be more liberal in book selection. Library school does not always cause this liberalization because apparently not all library school professors encourage students to be liberal when selecting books.

There are several possible reasons that greater differences were not found between the library school graduates and the untrained librarians. It could be that professional library education does not contribute as much to the effectiveness of librarians as is sometimes assumed. It is possible that students learn enough from a general educational program to be good book selectors.

On the other hand, it may be that the criteria which were used to evaluate book selectors are not the best ones. If it could be shown that the criteria used in this study do not really lead to good book selection, the results of the study would be questionable. The principles of public library book selection are not indisputably established; therefore it could not be argued with certainty that the measurements used in this study are necessarily the best measurements of good book selection, or that there are not better measurements which were not used. The investigator made an extensive study of the literature of library administration and book selection, however, in order to identify criteria for judging competence in book selection and feels that the criteria used are reasonably valid.

Certain measurements were not used in this study, however, because it was discovered that librarians were unable to answer the questions necessary to make these measurements. It is possible that these measurements are important ones which would have revealed significant differences between library school graduates and non-graduates. It had been decided originally to measure the frequency with which librarians used each book selection aid and the amount of time they spent on each aid. In the pretests, however, librarians explained that they could not accurately answer questions about the number of times they used a particular aid because their behavior varied on this from time to time or about time spent in selection because they often did book selection in spare moments in the library and at home, and it would be impossible to estimate total time spent. Therefore, these measurements were not used in this study.

Another reason why the differences between the two groups of librarians were not greater may be knowledge of books and authors, an area which was not investigated in this study. Possibly good book selection is more strongly related to knowledge of the literature than to library school education. Since book knowledge is acquired through wide reading and general education rather than in professional courses, one would not expect that library school graduates would necessarily have more of such knowledge than non-graduates and therefore, would not expect the graduates to be better book selectors than the other librarians. It is possible that greater differences would have been found between graduates and non-graduates if reference work or cataloging, rather than book selection, had been studied since it is doubtful that untrained librarians would have learned a great deal about the former activities from personal reading or general education.

Another possibility is that one year of library school may not be sufficient to prepare superior librarians. Library school students have to learn so much in one year about a great many different types of library activities that they may not have time to study one activity, such as book selection, in sufficient depth.

Most of the library school graduates who were included in this study received their professional training a number of years ago. Perhaps in the passage of time they forgot much of what they were taught about book selection or for some other reason fell into undesirable practices.

It is also possible that library schools have improved their programs in recent years since they now offer the master's degree rather than the bachelor's degree which some of the respondents received. Library school faculty have also been involved in curriculum evaluation within recent years which may have led to improvement. Therefore, study of more recent graduates might yield more positive results than were found in this study. However, most of the graduates studied had attended top-ranking library schools, and it is doubtful that present-day library schools are much better than those schools were in the 1940's or 1950's.

The fact that all the participants in this study had a number of years of experience is probably a relevant factor in the small differences discovered between the library school graduates and the non-graduates. It is possible that after a certain number of years of library work experience, the differences between trained and untrained librarians would be rather small because the untrained have had an opportunity to learn from experience much of what the graduates learned in library school. If librarians with only one or two years of library experience had been compared with those who had ten or fifteen years of experience, fairly large differences between the two groups might have been found. Moreover, if recent library school graduates had been compared with untrained librarians who had little or no library experience, the differences found between the two groups might have been greater than those discovered in this investigation.

Perhaps the greatest value of library school education is that it shortens the time required to become a competent librarian; thus the newly graduated librarian may have as much knowledge of library science as the untrained librarian with a number of years of experience because the former has devoted most of his time during one year to a study of librarianship while the latter has fewer opportunities to study library principles and practices. The newly graduated librarian would be expected to know much more about library science than the untrained librarian with only one or two years of experience because the former has spent much more time studying library science than the latter.

Validity of the Findings

It might be argued that the results of this study may not be typical because not a large number of librarians were investigated. Certainly the results of this study should be validated on other samples before final conclusions are made. However, since the libraries studied are fairly typical of smaller libraries in such things as expenditures, size of collection and size of staff, and since librarians were not selected in a biased manner, the results secured in this investigation might very well be typical for the total population of book selectors working in small public libraries.

Some may feel that the investigation of a large sample would be necessary, but study of a large number of cases is not necessarily better than study of a small number. In the present study the investigator included only 20 librarians and was therefore able to probe much more deeply than he could have done if he had used a larger number of cases. Inclusion of a large group of librarians probably would have necessitated the use of mail questionnaires for at least part of the study, and questionnaires have many inherent disadvantages. Only rarely are all questionnaires returned; often the return is only 50 or 60 percent, and the investigator has no way of knowing whether the non-respondents are atypical. Moreover, respondents often misunderstand printed questions and researchers sometimes do not understand written replies from respondents, and there is little opportunity to clear up such misunderstandings if questionnaires are used. The interview, however, provides some opportunity to clear up such misunderstandings. In this study there were a number of instances in which misunderstandings between investigator and respondent were easily cleared up. For example, even though it was clearly explained that the study was not concerned with selection of children's materials, one librarian named several juvenile selection aids when asked about which aids she used. When queried about this, she corrected herself explaining that she had not realized that children's aids were not being studied.

The respondents were probably more truthful when being interviewed than they would have been on questionnaires since they knew that many of their answers could easily be checked by the interviewer. Librarians' answers to the interview question about the number of books on restricted shelves were found to be quite truthful when the restricted shelves were examined by the researcher. It is possible that some librarians would have stated they had fewer such books on a questionnaire since they would feel there was little likelihood that such a statement would be checked.

In general the respondents seemed to be quite truthful in the interviews. They had been told that there were no right or wrong answers to questions and had been assured their replies would be kept confidential. The purpose of comparing librarians having varying amounts of professional education was not explained because it was felt that such an explanation might lead to anxiety which could cause exaggeration or untruth.

In response to some of the queries about controversial books, some of the librarians seemed not entirely candid, but they probably would have been even less candid, if they had had to commit their ideas on such books to writing. Several stated that they purchased books which were frank about sex because they had patrons who liked to read such books. Other librarians quite openly reported attempts to intimidate them by community leaders or library board members who disapproved of certain books. They probably would have been more reticent to express such ideas in writing. In general, most of the librarians seemed to be making every effort to be truthful; therefore, it seems that the effect on this study of untruth or exaggeration would be minimal.

Implications for Library Schools

Since most of the graduates included in this study received their library school education a number of years ago, it is conceivable that the study may not have a great many implications for present-day library education. The schools may have improved somewhat; therefore, the inadequacies which seemed to be related to the training of the librarians might not be pertinent today. However, as mentioned above, most of the graduates studied received their professional education at top-ranking library schools, and it is questionable whether many library schools today are better schools than those institutions were at the time when the librarians studied received their training.

Some of the library school graduates did not seem as concerned as they might be with the importance of evaluating books which they purchased. A number of the graduates received books on standing order from book clubs or rental libraries which provided little opportunity for pre-evaluation of selections. Therefore, it seems essential that library school faculty members strongly emphasize the importance of evaluating materials.

Very few of the graduates used the more specialized book selection aids. Only two reported use of Science Newsletter and one used Scientific American. None used Books Abroad or lists published by large libraries. Although specialized aids are not as essential for book selection in small public libraries as in other types of libraries, they certainly would be useful. Library school professors might encourage students to use specialized aids at least occasionally rather than rely completely on standard aids such as Booklist and Library Journal even though this type of tool is, in general, the most appropriate for small libraries.

The data collected suggest that library schools had failed to impress the graduates with the importance of building library collections unfettered by restrictions on controversial books. In fact, some of the graduates reported that faculty members had warned them not to purchase books which might cause problems. Possibly library school faculty are more liberal at the present time than they were in the past, but this is by no means certain. There are reports of book selection courses in which the issue of censorship is ignored.

Since the leaders of the profession have adopted strong anti-censorship principles which are in conformity with traditional concepts of American freedom, library school faculty members should vigorously teach the importance of building free collections containing all sorts of books and ideas. The Freedom to Read doctrine can logically be taught in courses in book selection, library administration, and reading guidance. Exposure to this theory in several courses and from various faculty members should ingrain the importance of a truly free library on a student's consciousness. Moreover, a great deal of exposure to the concept might have the desired effect of liberalizing the attitudes of those library school students who may be pro-censorship by reason of their family or religious background.

It is possible that library school graduates, after serving for a number of years in libraries, become in some way "contaminated" by the practical world and need to spend some time in "retreat" in library schools in order to regain their original zeal for library work. Some of the graduates, all of whom had considerable library experience since their graduation from library school, seemed to be less concerned with carefully evaluating books than they should be and were not completely committed to the principle of freedom to read. Perhaps they had been more committed to the ideals of librarianship when new in the field, but the pressures of the workaday world had changed their attitudes. It would seem to be very desirable for library schools to sponsor workshops or institutes for working librarians--institutes on such matters as use of selection aids and the freedom to read.

Some such workshops have been held in the past, but many more would seem to be needed.

Suggestions for Further Research

Further study should be undertaken to validate the findings of this present study since generally the results of research cannot be considered final until they are found to be true in a great number of situations. Elements of the present study could be repeated with any improvements in methodology which might be devised on the basis of the weaknesses of this study and the ingenuity of another researcher.

In-depth case studies of just a few librarians could yield very fruitful results. An investigator might, for example, find several librarians who are considered excellent book selectors and several who are considered poor selectors and spend a great deal of time with each one in order to get some idea of the causal elements which have led to good or poor book selection. Such things as personal characteristics, book knowledge, and methods of doing selection work could be studied.

In the present study all the librarians surveyed were women; therefore it would be desirable for some future researcher to compare men and women librarians. Research in education and sociology has shown that sex has a strong relationship to attitudes and behavior, and it is important to know what relationship, if any, it has to book selection practices.

In this present investigation librarians with considerable library school experience were studied, and it was found that those with library school education were only moderately more competent than the untrained librarians. It may be that the professionals, when they had only recently graduated from library school were much more competent than the untrained librarians when the latter had only a little experience, but that the untrained, over a period of years, had been able to learn from experience much of what the graduates had learned in one year of library school. As a follow-up to the present study, an investigation of differences between recent graduates and untrained librarians with little experience, perhaps one year, would be very desirable in order to test the theory that there would be large differences between the two groups because students are able, in library school, to learn much more quickly than librarians can learn from library experience.

It would be difficult to find situations in which librarians with little experience were doing all the book selection for their libraries as was done in the present study; therefore, it would probably be necessary to study young librarians who did only part of the selection for their libraries and to investigate some of their methods and attitudes. Perhaps the "quality" of their selections should not be measured because the books they select might have to be approved by their superior, and they would not have complete responsibility for selection as did the librarians in this study; thus true responsibility for the purchase of a given book could not be ascertained. Alternatively, a test situation could be devised. Young librarians, graduates and non-graduates, could be told to imagine they had complete responsibility for selection and asked to select perhaps several hundred books. Then the selections of both groups could be compared.

Study should be done to find out when and if "blurring" between library school graduates and untrained librarians takes place; that is, when and if greater experience leads to smaller differences between the two groups of librarians. Graduates and untrained librarians with similar amounts of experience could be studied, those with one year, those with two years, etc. Then it might be clear at what point the differences tend to become smaller.

Further study might also deal with other types of libraries. Does library school education have a greater or a lesser effect on book selection performance in academic or special libraries or in large public libraries than it has on performance in small public libraries? It is possible, for example, that book selection courses do not provide much help to librarians who work in acquisitions departments of large research libraries and that knowledge of the subject literature is more important than knowledge of the principles and practices of book selection.

It is also possible that types of library activities, other than book selection, are more strongly influenced by library education than selection work is. A study of reference service might be undertaken in order to find out whether library school graduates answer reference questions more accurately or more quickly than untrained librarians or whether graduates use more effective reference interviews than non-graduates. The relationship of library school education to competence in library administration, cataloging, and reading guidance also deserves study.

Librarians with two years or more of library school education should be compared with those who have had only one year in order to determine whether the former are superior to the latter. Some educators feel that members of certain professions need several years of library science education. Librarians who have both a bachelor's and a master's degree in library science might be compared with those who have only one degree. If research were to reveal considerable differences between the two groups which favored those with two years of library science training, the argument that one year of professional education is not enough would be strengthened. Such research would also have implications for the development of one-year training programs beyond the present Master of Science degree. At present only a few library schools offer such programs.

More study of the relationship between type of community and selection is also needed. In this investigation one test was made of the relationship between educational level of communities and number of controversial books selected, and a small relationship was found. Much more research is needed in this matter, however, to ascertain effects of type of community on such matters as controversial books selected and subjects and quality of books selected.

It is possible that competence in book selection is strongly related to knowledge of books and authors, perhaps more strongly than to professional education. Some study of this relationship would be valuable. The book knowledge of the best and poorest selectors could be compared, or conversely the book knowledge of a group of librarians could be tested and then the book selection competence of those most knowledgeable about books and those least knowledgeable could be compared.

In general, the present study supports the claim that there are real, but not large, differences between library school graduates and untrained librarians and that the former are better book selectors than the latter. The fact that only moderate differences were discovered is not surprising since most research on the effect of education reveals only small or moderate differences between those who have completed a particular training course and those who have not. The reasons that greater differences are not discovered are not clear. It may be that researchers, including the present investigator, have not been able to devise the most meaningful measurements which would show significant differences between those who have completed particular educational programs and those who have not. Hopefully, finer measurements will be devised in the future which will allow more valid study to be done than that which has been done heretofore.

LD PUB. 90